Class 283.09 Book H763
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York
v.11

*Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by*
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/livesofarchbisho0000walt

# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

Reformation Period.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

BY

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. F.R.S.

DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

REFORMATION PERIOD.

History which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth or pretendeth to represent; for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call Chronicles, the second Lives, and the third Narratives or Relations. Of these, although Chronicles be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet Lives excelleth in profit and use, and Narratives or Relations in verity or sincerity. LORD BACON.

LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,

Publishers in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen.

1879.

*The right of translation is reserved.*

283.09
H763
v. 11

42925

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

## VOL. XI.

Reformation Period

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

BY

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. F.R.S.

DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

VOLUME XI.

REFORMATION PERIOD.

History which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth or pretendeth to represent; for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call Chronicles, the second Lives, and the third Narratives or Relations. Of these, although Chronicles be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet Lives excelleth in profit and use, and Narratives or Relations in verity or sincerity. LORD BACON.

LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,

Publishers in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen.

1879.

*The right of translation is reserved.*

# ADVERTISEMENT.

The Life of Archbishop Juxon has been added in this volume, to the Life of Archbishop Laud, because I have been desirous of bringing to a conclusion that portion of our history which I have designated as the Reformation Period.

In the many volumes I have been permitted to write, I have traced the biographies of our primates from Augustine to Lanfranc, and from Lanfranc to Warham. The Reformation movement commenced in the primacy of Warham, and ceased in the primacy of Juxon,—since which time we have remained stationary. Neither Warham nor Juxon took an active part in the Reformation, but it was carried on under their auspices. In Sheldon the aged Juxon found a representative ready to suggest and to act, and to Sheldon we may look as our great reformer. In Warham's time the demand for a reformation of the Church, as in former volumes we have seen, universally prevailed; and in England there was a master mind, which in conjunction with the determined will and powerful intellect of the king, might have effected great things for the national Church. But Cardinal Wolsey, powerful as a statesman, was wanting in moral weight of character, and sacrificed an immortal fame to vulgar ambition and self-interest. He might have directed the

mind of Henry, who, with all his faults, was a great king and a true patriot and not without a sentiment of religion, to the noble object which was not accomplished till 1662. He left his master a prey to his passions, and so without an adviser. Henry had clever servants to work his will, but after Wolsey, there was none to sway his judgment.

Henry VIII. failed as a reformer, because, acting on the spur of the moment and under the dictates of his passions, no definite object was set before him, and even his opposition to the pope was the result of anger and self-interest rather than the conviction of an enlightened mind, capable of enlightenment, as that mind doubtless was.

What is now said of Henry VIII. may be predicated with equal truth of his servant Archbishop Cranmer, whose weakness of character quailed before the very look of the king, who probably on that account regarded him with the complacency of friendship. Dr. Cranmer knew that something must be done, but what that something was to be he could not tell,—and to this we may trace much of his weakness and inconsistency.

On one point, however, Henry was determined; he was a Catholic, and in spite of his quarrel with the pope, a Catholic he remained, and his Church was to be treated as the one Catholic Church in England. Whether Archbishop Cranmer fully realised the strength of this position, which true churchmen have always maintained, may be doubted, but his writings exist to show that in theory he accepted this truth; of which a sadder proof is given in the unhappy people he burnt as heretics, until he himself obtained fame by being unjustly condemned to the flames.

The tendency of his successor in the primacy, Cardinal Pole, was certainly to a reformation of the Church, though

instead of consulting foreign Protestants, like Dr. Cranmer, he sought to obtain the sanction of Rome to the movement, until he gave up the cause in despair, and was condemned by the very pope he had wished to serve.

The reformer of the 16th century to whom we are most indebted is Matthew Parker. He clearly saw his way, and had a great end before him. He accepted the creed when it speaks of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; he understood with the primitive Christians that our Blessed Lord and Master had established a mighty kingdom in the universe ; the glorified Church in heaven, and the Church militant on earth, through which the kingdom was to be propagated, and a people prepared to reign in glory. The Church is one through the succession of its governors, and he saw that of this one Church there are many colonies. He understood that, as was the case with other mighty empires, even of human institution, some of the colonies were in a state of moral degradation. When this was the case, it was not necessary to destroy an offending colony, or to place it under a new government,—what was required was a revision of the laws and the introduction of useful reforms. He directed his own attention to that colony with which he was himself immediately concerned. The modern notion of conceding truth in order to win partisans never crossed his mind. From his time down to the year 1662, the one object of the Church was to establish the truth ; and this grand principle has, at times, rendered the Church of England unpopular. Her motto is the truth; the whole truth, as against Puritans, and nothing but the truth, as against Romanists. The mind of Queen Elizabeth was indoctrinated by Archbishop Parker, and if he or his successors

seemed to relax in this their duty, she would show her indignation while she coerced them to act. But the Church suffered much of detriment in Parker's time, by the queen's attacks upon its property at the instigation of her greedy and unprincipled courtiers.

As the queen advanced in years and was influenced by Whitgift, this evil was to a considerable extent remedied; and during Whitgift's primacy the Church regained its right position, and its real character was developed.

They who distinguished between the one Catholic Church, and the sects by which it was surrounded, were nearly driven to despair when they found a Presbyterian (such as James I. was supposed to be) ascending the throne. It seemed like a miracle in answer to prayer, when the new king accepted the Church, and recognised its real position as a part of the constitution which he had inherited.

The weakness of will on the part of James I. and the weakness of character, which, though united with sincere piety, characterised Charles I., led to those events which we have to record in the biographies of Laud and Juxon,—to the martyrdom of a primate and the death of a king.

Throughout this period, the Church was sustained in its principles, by the blessing of that Prayer Book which retained what was primitive and catholic, rejecting only the accretion of novelties which has made the Church of Rome not the representative of the primitive Church, but merely of Mediævalism. During the Middle Ages, our own Church was not in possession of a Book of Common Prayer. Various dioceses, as we have seen in former volumes, adopted different formularies under the title of

"Uses." In the words of the Prayer Book, there had been great diversity in saying and singing in the churches of this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln. It was a grand idea, to determine upon the adoption of one use for the entire Church. A step was taken in advance when the two Prayer Books of Edward VI. were adopted. But we may regard it as a providential mercy, that the reformers of that reign were obliged to leave their work incomplete, for it is impossible to conjecture the extent to which the weakness of Cranmer and his coadjutors would have carried them in the way of concession, (especially when they called in the aid of foreigners,) if they had not been stopped in their career. A wise course was adopted on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, at the instigation of Parker, when the Prayer Books of Edward VI. were made the basis of the public formularies adopted in the reign of the great queen,—Parker not seeking to please foreigners or sects in communion with them, but to adhere to positive truth. The Prayer Book then established remained in force until its further and final reformation, through the amendments adopted by the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, was ratified by the Act of Uniformity under King Charles II.

The Prayer Book then reformed has continued unchanged to the present time. Hereafter we may see, in the suspension of Convocation during the greater part of the last century, another providential mercy extended to the Church in this land, by preventing alterations suggested by the Latitudinarians and political primates.

Gradually the love of the Prayer Book won its way among the people, and conciliated their affections. We

are by no means prepared to say that abuses have not arisen, or that they do not require to be removed. On the walls of the most cleanly abode cobwebs will sometimes be discovered; and everything consigned by Divine wisdom to the agency of man is liable to imperfection. In the most splendid mansion it may be necessary to add new apartments to meet the exigencies of the family or of the times. Ancient furniture may need to be burnished and repaired as well as adapted to modern uses. All this we freely admit, but if men exaggerate deficiencies or exercise their imagination to discover defects; if they are continually dwelling upon them, so that they can neither see for themselves nor point out to others the peculiar advantages which the Reformed Church in this country possesses, there cannot be for that Church and its Liturgy the affection and love without which no devoted service can be rendered. It was said by Grotius that "the English Liturgy is the finest in the world," and it is so, in the dignified simplicity of its ancient and significant ceremonies, in the chastened fervour of its prayers, in the heavenly aspiration of its praises, in the condensation of language in which the feelings it suggests are expressed.

Of all the documents we possess, I know not any more worthy of attention than the Preface to the Book of 1662, more frequently praised, it is to be feared, than read. It is said, "Although we know it impossible, in such varieties of humour and interests as are in the world to please all; nor can expect that men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied with anything that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves: yet we have good hope that what is here

presented, and hath been by the convocations of both provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also accepted and approved by all the peaceable and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

At the present time, what is said in the original preface of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained, is worthy of especial notice: "Of such ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning in the institution of man, some were at first of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned into vanity and superstition; some entered into the Church by undiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they much blinded the people and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected; other there be which, though they be devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church (for which they were first devised), as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church, as the apostle teaches, ought to be referred.

"And although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is of no small offence before God. Let all things be done among you, saith St. Paul, in a seemly and due order. The appointment of the whole order pertaineth not to private men, therefore no man ought to take in hand nor presume to appoint or alter any public or common order in Christ's church, except he be lawfully called and authorised thereunto.

"And whereas in this instance, the minds of men are so diverse, that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and again some be so new fangled that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old that nothing can like them but that is new, it was thought expedient not so much how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God and profit them both."

For more than two centuries the work of the great divines who thus revised the Book of Common Prayer has remained, and won its way to the hearts of the people, so that whatever may be the difficulties we have to encounter, the vast majority of Christians will adopt the sentiments of Dr. South, when, declaring our Liturgy to be the greatest treasure of rational devotion in the world, he adds, "and I know of no prayer necessary that is not in the Liturgy but one; which is this: That God would vouchsafe to continue the Liturgy itself in use, honour, and veneration in this Church for ever. I doubt not that all wise, sober, and good Christians will with equal judgment and affection, give it their *Amen*."

# CONTENTS

OF

# THE ELEVENTH VOLUME.

## BOOK IV.—*continued.*

### CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE HISTORY OF LAUD TO THE TIME OF HIS EPISCOPATE.

Parentage and birth of Laud.—His education at Reading school, and St. John's College, Oxford.—Takes his degree, and is ordained.—State of theology at Oxford.—Laud's standpoint in doctrine.—His offence in the matter of the Duke of Devonshire's marriage.—Accused of popery at Oxford and Cambridge.—His preferments.—Elected president of St. John's College, and appointed chaplain to the king.—Presented to the deanery of Gloucester.—Difficulties at Gloucester.—His zeal and success.—Intemperate preaching at Oxford.—Directions issued by the king.—Laud accompanies King James to Scotland. Failure of the Articles of Perth.—Beginning of the Sabbatarian controversy.—Laud returns to Oxford.—His ill-health.—King James's illness, and thanksgiving for recovery at St. Paul's.—Death of the queen.—Laud is installed Prebendary of Westminster.—He preaches before the king.—Nominated Bishop of St. David's,—Delay in consecration.—He resigns the presidentship of St. John's College . . . . . page 1

### CHAPTER XXXIV.

LAUD'S EPISCOPATE.

Friendship between Laud and Buckingham.—Controversy with Fisher.—Refutation of Fisher written by Laud.—His anxiety about Buckingham.—Proposal to confiscate the Revenues of Charter House.—Opposed by Laud.—Business in Parliament.—Laud visits his Diocese.—His dreams.—His work.—His prayers.—Seditious Preaching at Oxford.—The Royal Injunctions.—Consequent ferment among the Puritans.—Spanish journey of the Prince of Wales.—Breach between

Williams and Laud.—Intimacy of Laud with Prince Charles.—Meeting of Convocation.—Death of King James.—Accession of Charles.—Attempts made to prejudice the King against Laud are unsuccessful.—Funeral of King James.—Arrival of Queen Henrietta Maria.—Consequences of the Royal Marriage.—Case of Dr. Mountague.—Proceedings against him revoked by the King.—Parliament meets at Oxford.—Laud revisits his Diocese.—His ill-health.—Appointed Deputy Clerk of the Closet.—Royal letters against Papists and Puritans.—Letter to Buckingham on the birth of his son.—Preparations for the Coronation.—Laud to act as Dean of Westminster on the occasion.—The Coronation.—Attacks upon Laud for alleged alterations in the Ceremonial.—Second Parliament.—Attack on Mountague renewed.—Prosecution of Buckingham.—Laud accused of writing the Speeches for the King and Duke.—Goodman's Sermon.—His obstinacy.—Laud nominated Bishop of Bath and Wells.—Subsidies from Convocation required by the King, and instructions drawn up by Laud.—Death of Bishop Andrewes.—Laud succeeds as Dean of the Chapel Royal.—The cases of Sibthorpe and Manwaring.—Laud the King's adviser during Buckingham's absence.—His translation to the See of London designed.—Failure of Buckingham at Rochelle.—Laud meets with an accident.—Heylyn's visit to him.—Laud preaches before the Third Parliament.—Attitude of the Commons on the Religious question.—The Remonstrance.—Answered by Laud.—His translation to London effected.—Murder of the Duke of Buckingham . . . . . 48

## CHAPTER XXXV.

### WILLIAM LAUD A STATESMAN.

Laud as a statesman.—The Caroline divines.—State of matters at Oxford.—Reform in the election of Proctors.—Reform of the University statutes.—Laud, Chancellor of Oxford.—His benefactions to his College and the University.—The Royal Declaration appended to the Thirty-nine Articles.—Petition of the Puritans.—The case of the Feoffees.—Measures of conciliation.—Attitude of the House of Commons.—Attacks upon Laud.—His illness.—He devises measures for correcting abuses in the Church.—Royal instructions.—Controversial preaching forbidden.—Bishop Davenant's troubles.—Itinerant lecturers suppressed.—Violent preaching at Oxford.—The many projects of Laud.—Restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral.—Controversies at Oxford.—Proceedings in the Star Chamber.—The case of Leighton.—And of Prynne.—Changes in the Bishoprics.—The painted window at Salisbury.—The foreign chaplaincies.—Royal visit to Scotland.—Death of Archbishop Abbot . . . . . 162

## CHAPTER XXXVI.

### LAUD'S PRIMACY.

Laud's translation to the Primacy.—His friendship with Wentworth.—State of the Primate of England.—Visit of Hyde.—Offer of a Cardinal's hat.—Chillingworth.—Hatred of the Papists against Laud.—An accident.—Titles for Holy Orders.—Royal letter.—Sabbatarian question revived.—Republication of the "Declaration."—Ideas of the Puritans.—The metropolitical visitation.—The position of the Communion table in churches.—Opposition to Laud's order.—Headed by the Bishop of Lincoln.—Controversy thereupon.—Laud suspends the jurisdiction of Williams.—Cathedral statutes and regulations.—Chapels for the use of Foreigners.—Poor condition of the London clergy.—Object of Laud and Strafford in Ireland.—Condition of Ireland under Strafford.—Laud Chancellor of the University of Dublin.—The Thirty-nine Articles introduced.—Affairs in Scotland.—The Scotch Liturgy.—Riots in Edinburgh.—The Covenant.—Ministers of the Palatinate.—Visit of the Prince Elector.—Laud appointed Lord Treasurer.—Juxon succeeds him.—Letters of Laud against Puritanism, and against Popery.—The Archbishop's right to visit the Universities.—Royal visit to Oxford.—State of the country.—Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton prosecuted and punished.—Williams summoned before the Star Chamber.—Visitation of Jersey and the Channel Islands.—Laud's energy against Romanism, and Socinianism.—Further disturbances in Scotland.—The Short Parliament.—Proceedings of Convocation.—The Long Parliament.—Impeachment of Strafford.—The Scottish Commissioners in London.—Vote of the Commons against Laud.—Taken into custody.—Resigns the Chancellorship of Oxford.—Articles against him.—Speech in the House of Lords.—Committal to the Tower . . . . . 225

## CHAPTER XXXVII.

### LAUD IN THE TOWER AND ON TRIAL.

Laud in the Tower.—Visited by his friends.—Urged to escape.—Opportunities for escape given.—His confinement made more irksome.—Committee of Religion.—Trial of the Earl of Strafford.—Excitement of the populace against the Earl.—The king passes the bill of attainder.—Usher visits Strafford.—Farewell between Strafford and Laud.—Death of Strafford.—Impeachment of Bishops.—The Bishops deprived of jurisdiction.—Libellous attacks made upon Laud.—Sequestration of his jurisdiction, and his estate.—Weakness of the

king.—Visit of Prynne to the Archbishop's chambers.—Seizure of his papers.—Temporalities and patronage taken by Parliament.—A parliamentary synod.—Laud subjected to great annoyances.—Fourteen articles displayed against Laud.—He appears before the bar of the House.—The charge against him, misdemeanour or treason?—Delay of trial.—Unfair treatment of Laud in the House of Lords.—The Trial.—Laud's reply to Wilde's speech.—The Archbishop treated with scorn.—Multiplicity of charges against Laud.—His speech in defence.—Prynne's description of it.—Laud is attainted at the bar of high treason.—His answer in the Commons.—He appeals to the House.—Voted guilty of high treason in the Commons.—And in the Lords.—The king sends a free pardon.—Laud is condemned to be hung.—His request to be beheaded is granted.—He prepares for death.—Cruel questions put to him on the scaffold.—His last sermon.—His last prayer.—Laud is beheaded.—His last will and testament . . . . . 332

## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

WILLIAM JUXON.—TO THE DEATH OF THE KING.

Born at Chichester.—Educated at Merchant Taylors School, and St. John's, Oxford.—Studies law.—Ordained.—Vicar of St. Giles', Oxford.—Rector of Somerton.—President of St. John's.—Reforms statutes of the University.—Prebendary of Chichester.—Clerk of the Closet.—Dean of the Chapel Royal.—Elected to the See of Hereford.—Bishop of London.—Sworn of the Privy Council.—Present from Merchant Taylors.—Lord Treasurer.—Advice to the king in Strafford's case.—Scotch Prayer Book.—Resigns treasurership.—King consults Juxon.—Sends for him at his trial.—King's last moments.—Books sent to his children.—Lesson for the day.—"Remember."—Royal funeral . . . . . 394

## CHAPTER XXXIX.

Juxon dispossessed of his papers and threatened with imprisonment.—Returns to Little Compton.—Private resources.—State of Clergy.—Fanatics.—The Engagement.—Juxon in his retirement.—Performs Service according to Prayer Book.—Toleration of Cromwell.—Juxon great in the hunting-field.—Anecdotes.—The Restoration.—Translation of Juxon.—Savoy Conference.—Baxter's Prayer Book.—Coronation of Charles II.—Convocation.—Parliament impatient for settlement of Religion.—The Act of Uniformity.—Death of Juxon.—His benefactions and will. . . . . 417

# SUCCESSION

OF

## ARCHBISHOPS AND CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

| Archbishops | Consecration | Consecrators | Accession | Death | Contemporary Sovereigns |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| William Laud | 1621 | George London<br>John Worcester<br>Nicholas Ely<br>Geo. Chichester<br>John Oxford<br>Theoph. Llandaff | 1633 | 1645 | Charles I. |
| William Juxon | 1633 | William Richard York<br>Fra. Ely<br>William Llandaff<br>John Rochester<br>John Oxford | 1660 | 1663 | Charles II. |

# TABLE

OF

## CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

| Date | England | Germany | France | Pope | Spain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1633 | Charles I. | Ferdinand II. | Louis XIII. | Urban VIII. | Philip IV. |
| 1637 | | Ferdinand III. | | | |
| 1643 | | | Louis XIV. | | |
| 1644 | | | | Innocent X. | |
| 1649 | Commonwealth | | | | |
| 1655 | | | | Alexander VII. | |
| 1658 | | Leopold I. | | | |
| 1660 | Charles II. | | | | |
| 1661 | | | | | Charles II. |

# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY

## BOOK IV.—*Continued.*

## CHAPTER XXXIII.

### THE HISTORY OF LAUD TO THE TIME OF HIS EPISCOPATE.

Parentage and birth of Laud.—His education at Reading school, and St. John's College, Oxford.—Takes his degree, and is ordained.—State of theology at Oxford.—Laud's standpoint in doctrine.—His offence in the matter of the Duke of Devonshire's marriage.—Accused of popery at Oxford and Cambridge.—His preferments.—Elected president of St. John's College, and appointed chaplain to the king.—Presented to the deanery of Gloucester.—Difficulties at Gloucester.—His zeal and success.—Intemperate preaching at Oxford.—Directions issued by the king.—Laud accompanies King James to Scotland.—Failure of the Articles of Perth.—Beginning of the Sabbatarian controversy.—Laud returns to Oxford.—His ill-health.—King James' illness, and thanksgiving for recovery at St. Paul's.—Death of the Queen.—Laud is installed Prebendary of Westminster—He preaches before the king.—Nominated Bishop of St. David's.—Delay in consecration.—He resigns the presidentship of St. John's College.



WILLIAM LAUD, when Archbishop of Canterbury, was walking in his gardens at Lambeth, and shewed some

*Authorities.*—The great authority for the life of Archbishop Laud, next to his own works, is the 'Cyprianus Anglicus,' by his chaplain,

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

unusual agitation in his manner, when he encountered his chaplain and confidential friend, Peter Heylyn. Heylyn approached the archbishop, but had the delicacy not to enquire into the circumstances of his agitation, until the primate himself volunteered to shew him a paper which contained certain libellous assertions. Among them his Grace was represented to have been born of a

Dr. Peter Heylyn. Heylyn was one of the first of the biographers, as we employ the word at the present time. But his work labours under a great disadvantage, for the authentic copy of Laud's Diary he never saw. This work was published by the very learned Henry Wharton in 1695, and Heylyn died in 1662. Heylyn was therefore obliged to make use of Prynne's publication of the Diary entitled the 'Breviat,' which was published in 1644. Of the many nefarious transactions of the period, we can scarcely mention any more infamous than the seizure of the primate's private papers, and their alteration and mutilation. Prynne omitted some things that tended to the primate's honour, and inserted other things for which there was no foundation in truth, to inflame the public mind against the doomed prelate. Notwithstanding this drawback, Heylyn's work is very valuable, and from the liveliness of the narrative it early became popular. The Diary is now corrected whenever it is published; and the errors of the 'Breviat' are pointed out. We may especially refer to the publication of the Diary in the Anglo-Catholic Library. Among the many well-edited works of that collection, the diligence and accuracy with which Laud's writings, including his letters, are preserved, are above all praise. The reader will observe that my own labours are different from what they were in times past. During the many Lives of the Archbishops that I have already written, I have had to search out my authorities from the original documents; and this, in some places, before the learned labours of Freeman, Stubbs, Brewer, and others had seen the light. My chief authority now will be Laud's own works. There is a life of Archbishop Laud by Lawson, and another by Le Bas. The former is chiefly a transcript of Heylyn, with copious remarks, not always very relevant. The latter is the work of a man of genius, though he does not exhibit sufficient diligence in research. Other works to which reference is made, are the histories, memorials, or collections of Rushworth, Clarendon, Whitelocke, Walker, Wood, Lloyd, Neal, Fuller (Brewer's edition), Nichols, Ellis, Collier, Guizot, the State Trials, Parliamentary Annals, and Journals of the Lords and Commons, &c.

parentage so base that it might appear he had been raked out of the dunghill. The primate remarked that, although he had not the good fortune to be born a gentleman, yet he thanked God that he had been born of honest parents, who lived in a plentiful condition, employed many poor people in their way, and left a good report behind them. Heylyn did not understand the archbishop, whose annoyance originated not in the assertion of the fact—the case of his predecessor Abbot being, as he himself observes, precisely similar to his own—but because that, in representing this as a crime, the malice of his enemies was exhibited. Having, as his manner was, expressed himself strongly, he restrained himself, and his countenance resumed its usual composure.*

Laud's parentage.

The truth is, that the parents of Laud were persons who had risen to considerable affluence, and occupied a distinguished position in the society of the place where they dwelt. His father was, by profession, a clothier in the town of Reading, where he was in a large way of business. He had several looms in his own house, and he also gave employment to many weavers, spinners, and fullers, out of his house. He married the widow of John Robinson ; and she was the sister of Sir William Webb, of Berkshire, a member of an old merchant family, who in the year 1591 filled the office of Lord Mayor of London.†

The inventions of Prynne, therefore, with regard to

* Cyp. Ang., 43–44. Still the Puritans represented Laud as rising "*ex fæce plebis.*" In these days, as in the middle ages, we esteem it an honour when a man elevates himself from the lower to the upper class of society. The present Archbishop of York, Dr. Thomson, the third peer of the realm, makes it his boast that his father was a tradesman and shopkeeper in the North of England; and one of his immediate predecessors was never ashamed of speaking of his father as a man engaged in trade. "*Quantum generi demas, virtutibus addes.*"

† Cyp. Ang., p. 46.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the parentage and position of the future Archbishop of Canterbury, are found, like most of his assertions, to be, when not absolutely falsehoods, exaggerations which, while stating a fact, insinuated a lie.

His birth.

William Laud was born on October 7, 1573, in the parish of St. Laurence, Reading: a parish famous for a magnificent abbey, founded there, in the year 1126,* by Henry I. The ruins stand close by the railroad at the present time; and in wandering over them many persons, like the writer of these pages, have been accustomed to employ their time when waiting for the trains.

His education.

William Laud was a sickly child, over whom his mother watched with anxiety and tender care.† Though never a strong man he outgrew the troubles of his childhood, and was sent for the rudiments of his education to the free school of his native town. Here he continued till he was sixteen years of age. Here also he so distinguished himself, that his master foretold his future eminence, and frequently expressed a hope, that when Laud should become a great man, he would not forget how much he owed to the training he received at Reading school.‡ His master was severe in his discipline, but came to the conclusions just mentioned from observing the strange dreams, witty speeches, generous spirit, great apprehension, and notable performances of his pupil.

Commoner of St. John's, Oxford.

At the age of sixteen William Laud was admitted a commoner of St. John's College, Oxford, where he was placed under the tuition of John Buckeridge, fellow, and afterwards president of the college. Buckeridge was devoted to the cause of the Reformed Church of England, and wielded with ability "the two-edged sword of Holy Scripture" against the Papists on the one side and against the Puritans on the other. A treatise written by him,

* Dugdale's Mon. Ang., i. p. 417. Lansdown MSS., 721.

† Diary, A.D. 1573. ‡ Lloyd's Memoires, p. 225.

entitled *De Potestate Papæ in Temporalibus*, was very highly esteemed, and was unanswered by the Romanists. He also took the lead in the controversy concerning kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and maintained the antiquity and piety of a reverent posture in that holy ordinance. He was one of four divines * appointed by King James to preach before his majesty at Hampton Court, with the object of bringing the Presbyterian Scots to a right understanding of the Church of England. All these preachers were afterwards promoted, and Dr. Buckeridge was appointed Bishop of Rochester. From this see he was, many years afterwards, through the interest of his former pupil, Laud, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, translated to the bishopric of Ely. In this case, and by every means in his power, Laud endeavoured to shew his gratitude for the great benefit he had derived from the instruction and example of this good man, equally distinguished for his orthodoxy and his learning.

Scholar of St. John's.

After he had been a year at college, Laud was appointed to a scholarship which had been attached to Reading school by the generosity of Sir Thomas White. For this preferment he was indebted partly to his own proficiency, and partly to the interest of his father, such influence on his father's part shewing the esteem in which he was held. Laud was not a man to conciliate strangers by his outward deportment, and his manners were such as to provoke his adversaries and to make them active in their enmity. He was small in stature, and, as a contemporary describes him, "a very forward, confident, and zealous person." † The fact that he was, in spite of these defects, surrounded through life by devoted friends, sufficiently proves the truth of what

* The others were Bishops Andrewes and Barlow, and Dr. King, Dean of Christ Church, afterwards Bishop of London.

† Wood, iii. col. 117, 122.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Heylyn affirms, that he shewed at all times much kindness of heart, ready always to compensate, by a generous act, the offence given by his abruptness of manner, and his occasional discourtesy.

Fellow of St. John's.

In the year 1593 he was admitted fellow of St. John's, and having become B.A. in 1594, he took his Master's

M.A. 1598.

degree in 1598, in which year he was appointed Grammar reader at his college, or as we should now say, tutor. His studies were so severe that, both in 1596 and in 1597, he was seriously unwell. At this period the see of Oxford was vacant, and remained vacant for no less

Ordained.

than eleven years.* Laud, therefore, sought ordination at the hands of the Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Young, in the year 1600. By the same prelate he was in the next year ordained priest. Young Laud had already become a marked man in the University, and was peculiarly obnoxious to his superiors, for, contrary to the prevalent

His studies

system, he had prosecuted his theological studies in the spirit of a canon made in Convocation in the year 1571, which enjoins, that the interpretation of Scripture should be regulated, not by a licentious exercise of private judgment, but a strict regard to the doctrines of the primitive Fathers of the Church. This Canon gave the direction to Laud's professional studies. It was remarked by the Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Young, that Laud's studies had not been confined to the narrow and partial systems of Geneva, but that his scheme of divinity had been raised "upon the noble foundation of the Fathers, the Councils, and the ecclesiastical historians."

State of theology at Oxford.

But a great change and reaction had taken place at Oxford. Fifty years before, almost all the heads of houses had been of the Romanist party in the Church of England, and had burned the Reformers. The reverend

* From 1592 till 1603.

heads and professors had now, however, rushed to the opposite extreme, and they were ready to burn any who refused to adhere to the doctrines of Geneva. To the violence of party feeling there had been exceptions, but not many.

Laurence Humphrey, fellow of Magdalen College, having been deprived of his fellowship in Queen Mary's reign, had taken up his abode at Zurich, where he inhaled deep draughts of the doctrines of Zuinglius ; and corresponded with the professors at Geneva. On his return to Oxford as "a moderate and conscientious nonconformist,"* he was made president of his college, and was also appointed, being an able and learned man, Regius professor of divinity. In the divinity chair he remained till the year 1596 ; being also, for a considerable time, vice-chancellor. The Calvinian doctrines, as they were then styled, were disseminated throughout the University and seemed to overpower all opposition. A lectureship was founded by Sir Francis Walsingham, with the purpose of widening the differences between Protestants and Papists ; and this was held by Dr. John Reynolds, who advanced the most extreme ideas of the Puritans. The celebrated, or notorious, Earl of Leicester, who was for many years Chancellor of the University, perceived it to be his interest to become the great patron of the Puritans. Under these circumstances the University was so much changed, that there was little trace in it of the principles and positions upon which the English Church had been at first reformed.†

Laurence Humphrey.

Dr. John Reynolds.

The theory of Calvinistic predestination was held as an essential ingredient in the faith of a Christian man ; the efficacy of the two sacraments was not only disputed but denied ; the authority of the Church was scornfully

* Fuller, ix. sec. 8, 33.

† Cyp. Ang., p. 47.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

disregarded ; and the very existence of a visible Church, during the period of papal predominance, was gravely questioned even by men of note. The fashion was to identify the English Church with the foreign Reformation, and to induce young men to suppose, contrary to the fact, not that the old Catholic Church of England had been forty or fifty years before reformed, but that an entirely new sect had been established.

Laud's standpoint in doctrine.

If we hold that ours is the old Church reformed, and that we retain the Apostolical Succession, we must, of course, admit the Roman Church to be a true, though a corrupt Church ; and Laud at this period being divinity lecturer at St. John's,* maintained the constant and perpetual visibility of the Church of Christ descended from the Apostles to the Church of Rome, and continued, through the missionaries of that Church, throughout Europe, though the supremacy of Rome was denied, as it still is by the Greek Church. The Reformation was merely an incident in the history of the English Church.

Hostility of Abbot.

The leader of the Puritan party, Dr. George Abbot, master of University College, and vice-chancellor, entertained very opposite views. He endeavoured, in a book he wrote on the subject, to trace a visible Church through the Berengarians, the Albigenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, down to Luther and Calvin. He resented deeply what he called the impertinence of a mere Master of Arts, in thinking differently from himself and the party he represented. The open resistance, made by Laud, to the authority of his name, Abbot never forgave. From this moment to the end of his days, Laud was an especial object of dislike to Abbot, by whom we should scarcely err if we described Laud as persecuted, so far as Abbot's powers permitted. Laud was represented as a

* He also held Case's exhibition for students in divinity. Wood's Hist. of Colleges, vol. i. p. 540.

friend of popery, and as a sworn enemy of the Gospel of Christ. His good deeds were ascribed to wrong motives, and they laid to his charge things that he knew not. Alas! that Christians should forget the spirit and principles of Christianity. Certainly if Laud sinned, he was "sinned against."

But Laud was not a man to be daunted by contradiction, or even by persecution. He had the truth, and by the truth he intended to abide. Consequently, in his exercise for his degree of Bachelor in Divinity, he maintained—first, the necessity of baptism; and, secondly, that there could be no true Church without diocesan bishops. He thus provoked still further the wrath of several of the heads of houses; and Dr. Holland openly reprehended him in the schools for "a seditious person who would reimbark the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond the seas, and now sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this novel popish proposition." It was also asserted, that what he advanced with regard to baptism was taken verbatim out of Bellarmine, a statement which Laud, on his trial, indignantly denied.* But a change had begun, and that the opinions so persistently maintained by the young M.A. commended themselves to the judgment of many of the thoughtful and more learned members of the University, may be inferred by his having been elected proctor without any canvass on his part.

B.D.

Elected proctor.

This must have been a triumph, for a little before, he informs us that he underwent much moral persecution at Oxford, so that at one time it was even a scandal for any person to be seen in his company, or to give him the usual compliment as he passed in the streets.†

* Prynne, Breviat, p. 2. Troubles and Trial, Laud's Works, vol. iv. p. 310.

† Wood's Annals, vol. ii. pt. i. pp. 288, 289. Cyp. Ang., p. 49.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

He was especially opposed by a very good, though a very narrow-minded man, a most intolerant Puritan, Dr. Henry Airay, Provost of Queen's, and vice-chancellor in 1606. Laud preached a sermon about this period, which was severely handled by the vice-chancellor, and brought down upon him the charge of popery. Laud defended himself with undaunted courage, and his enemies could not discover, after strict examination, any portion of the sermon, which, as members of the Church of England, they could require him to retract. But Dr. Airay was not satisfied, and the Chancellor of the University, the Earl of Dorset, thought it right to interfere. He wrote to his vice-chancellor, saying that he had been informed that a sermon was lately made by Mr. Laud, a very excellent learned man, at which sermon his informant (Dr. Paddie) being present, he heard no just cause of offence; that nevertheless Mr. Laud had been convented before the vice-chancellor once, and it was purposed that he should be convented again; that two or three very learned men about the Court had seen and considered of the sermon and had given approbation of the same. He added that, as Mr. Laud would certainly appeal, to save the scandal of a report of their being distracted at Oxford, the chancellor himself thought of calling two or three learned divines, to order and compound the matter, as should be thought fit; but that he should prefer remanding the cause to the vice-chancellor again, trusting in his judgment, learning, and justice.*

Henry Airay.

This was again, in point of fact, another triumph on the part of Laud. But the cry against him, on the ground of his supposed inclination to popery, extended from Oxford to Cambridge, and produced a remarkable letter from Dr. Joseph Hall, who afterwards became a

Dr. Joseph Hall.

* Wood's Annals, *ut sup.*

devoted friend of Laud, but whose theological principles were not yet fully developed, and the tendency of whose mind at this time was to the Calvinistic school.* One passage may be quoted, both as a specimen of the style of the letter, and a description of Laud's real principles:—

"I would I knew where to find you, then I could tell how to take direct arms, whereas now I must pore and conjecture. To-day you are in the tents of the Romanists, to-morrow in ours; the next day between both, against both. Our adversaries think you ours; we, theirs; your conscience finds you with both, and neither: I flatter you not. How long will you halt in this indifferency? Resolve one way, and know at last what you do hold, and what you should cast off, either your wings, or your teeth, and loathing this bat-like nature, be either a bird or a beast. To die wavering and uncertain, yourself will grant fearful. If you must settle, when begin you? If you must begin, why not now? God crieth with Jehu, Who is on my side, who? Look out at your window to him, and in a resolute courage cast down the Jezebel that hath bewitched you."

Laud was not moved by this, or by similar invectives that were hurled against him, though he must have felt, that by his procedure, at this time, he was probably sacrificing all hopes of preferment and advancement. His object was to restore an adherence to the Church of England, and with this object in view he remained firm. His consistency was admired even by his enemies, and it was said of him, when he was on his trial, that he was always one and the same man; that beginning with him

* This is the celebrated Joseph Hall, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, who was in some degree converted to Church principles by Laud. His 'Episcopacy by Divine Right' was one of the best on that subject, and was written at the suggestion, and probably with the assistance, of Laud.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

at Oxford, and so going on to Canterbury, he was unmoved and unchanged; that he never complied with the times, but kept his own stand till the times came up to him.* Adhering thus firmly to the principles of the Church of England, and steering the middle course between extremes, Laud was unpopular at a time when party feeling ran very high in the Universities. Knowing his ability, his adversaries, headed by Abbot, would not acknowledge his worth. They depreciated him in every way they could, so that it was not till he was thirty-four years of age that preferment was offered to him. But his career received a check, and it was long before he regained the high position, he had so hardly won, and now so sadly lost.

Earl of Devonshire's marriage.

In 1603 Laud had been appointed chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire, and two years later he consented to marry the earl to the Lady Penelope Devereux, daughter of the Earl of Essex. On account of a criminal intercourse with the earl, the lady had been divorced from her husband, Lord Rich. The earl was desirous of repairing, by marriage, the injury he had inflicted on her reputation. An advocate of Laud might observe, that the legal principles applicable to such a case were, at that time, more unsettled than they now are; nevertheless, whatever may be advanced in palliation of the offence, Laud must have been aware that, when he performed the marriage ceremony, he was guilty of an illegal act. Nothing can justify conduct which betrayed weakness, in a character of which weakness was not a predominant fault, but in which there was ever a strict adherence to law and principle.

In those days the relation between a peer and his chaplain was much closer than it is now; and they who have read Laud's correspondence and observed his character will admit that, under a rough exterior, in his character

* Sir Edward Dering's Speech, coll., p. 5. Cyp. Ang., p. 52.

affectionate and grateful feelings predominated. He was a true friend, wherever he gave his friendship. He consented to officiate at the marriage, and of course he was thenceforth exposed to the deserved reproaches of the Puritans. But while his friends regretted his false step, and his enemies heaped coals of fire upon his head for his offence, they knew not that they were reproaching a poor penitent, who converted St. Stephen's Day, on which day he had performed the solemnity, into an annual fast, and used the following prayer composed by himself:—

His great sorrow and contrition.

"Behold Thy servant, O my God, and in the bowels of Thy mercy have compassion on me. Behold, I am become a reproach to Thy Holy Name, by serving my ambition, and the sins of others: which, though I did it by the persuasion of other men, yet my own conscience did check and upbraid me in it. Lord, I beseech Thee, for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me Thy servant, but hear His blood, imploring mercies for me. Neither let this marriage prove a divorcing of my soul from Thy grace and favour. For much more happy had I been if, being mindful of this day, I had suffered martyrdom as did St. Stephen the first of martyrs, denying that which either my less faithful friends, or less godly friends, had pressed upon me. I promised myself that the darkness would hide me. But that hope soon vanished away. Nor doth the light appear more plainly, than I that have committed that foul offence. Even so, O Lord, it pleased Thee, of Thine infinite mercy, to deject me with this heavy ignominy, that I might learn to seek Thy Name. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sins to this very day, after so many and such reiterated prayers, poured out unto Thee from a sorrowful and afflicted spirit. Be merciful unto me. Hearken to the prayers of Thy humble and dejected servant: and raise me up again, O Lord, that

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

I may not die in my sin, but that I may live with Thee hereafter; and, living, evermore rejoice in Thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour. Amen."

If any ambitious hopes were entertained by Laud from his connection with the Earl of Devonshire, they were disappointed. His advancement was slow. He

Vicar of Stanford, 1607.

was in the year 1607 presented to the vicarage of Stanford, in Northamptonshire,* and in the following year he obtained the advowson of North Kilworth in Leicestershire.† Shortly afterwards he proceeded

D.D. 1608.

Doctor of Divinity without any opposition, a proof that the Puritans recognised the growing strength of his party; and it may be a proof also that they did not take so much offence at his misconduct as he feared would be the case, though afterwards it became a subject of attack. The report of his abilities in the meantime had reached the Court, and despite the disfavour with which he was regarded by the king on account of his action in the Devonshire marriage, he was summoned to preach before his majesty at Theobalds, on the 17th of September, 1609. For this favour he was indebted to the good offices of Dr. Neile, Bishop of Rochester, who, on the recommendation of Dr. Buckeridge, had appointed him his chaplain. Bishop Neile is an instance of those persons who, without being themselves very able or learned, have the great gift of reading the characters of others. He surrounded himself with men eminent for ability and piety. His attachment to Laud was deep and lasting, and the friendship was fully and gratefully reciprocated. In order to be nearer his patron, Laud exchanged North Kilworth for the rectory of West Tilbury in Essex, and soon afterwards the bishop gave him the living of Cuckstone in

* Le Neve, p. 119. † Diary, April, 1608.

Kent. He now resigned his fellowship, left Oxford, and settled at Cuckstone. But the unhealthiness of the situation having thrown him into an ague, he exchanged his living soon afterwards for that of Norton, a benefice of less value, but in a better air.

Resigns his fellowship.

Laud's invariable practice, when invested with these livings, was to furnish the churches, to put the parsonage houses into thorough repair, and to grant to twelve poor people a constant allowance out of the income of the benefice.

His kind friend and patron, Bishop Neile, was presently translated to the bishopric of Lincoln; but his place at Rochester was filled, in December 1610, by a still older friend of Dr. Laud, Dr. Buckeridge.

Election to the Presidentship of St. John's, opposed.

The presidentship of St. John's being vacant by the promotion of Buckeridge, it was generally supposed that Laud would be appointed. Dr. Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury elect, was, however, very desirous to prevent his election, and urged Lord Ellesmere,* now Chancellor of the University, to move the king to interfere. His lordship, having lately been appointed to the chancellorship, was taking great care "to use all good means to discover and find out all such as should justly be suspected to be addicted or inclined to popery or puritanism, and not to suffer any such to lurk or hide themselves in or near this famous University."† Abbot represented Laud to be "at least a Papist in heart, and cordially addicted to popery;" and asserted, "that he kept company with none but professed and suspected Papists." He maintained that "if Laud were suffered to have any place of government in the University, it would undoubtedly turn to "the great detriment of religion, and dishonour of his lordship." The chancellor

* Thomas Egerton, Baron of Ellesmere, Lord High Chancellor.

† Wood, Ann., vol. ii. pt. i. p. 307.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

felt himself bound to address the king on the matter; and the royal veto would have prevented Laud's appointment, if Bishop Neile had not acquainted his majesty with his great abilities, and pointed out the old grudge which the archbishop-elect had against him.* Neile succeeded in his object of gaining the royal favour, and on the 10th of May, 1611, Laud was elected President of St. John's, though he himself was at the time very ill, and unable either to make interest in person, or by writing to his friends.

We have already remarked that Laud, throughout life, showed much weakness of constitution. He had good working health, but not enjoyable health. To this we may, in part, attribute that sharpness of temper which exasperated his opponents and was painful to himself; though Heylyn informs us that he was, almost immediately after an ebullition of temper, ready to make up for it by some kind word or action.

His temper must have been sorely tried when the election for the presidentship took place. For, after the result had been declared in Laud's favour, one of the fellows, attached to the Puritan cause, seized the paper containing the scrutiny and tore it in pieces. Laud could easily overlook a personal attack; he forgave the rudeness of the offender, and afterwards proved the sincerity of his forgiveness by making him his chaplain, by preferring him from one benefice to another, by marrying him to his niece, by finally promoting him to the very presidentship which had been the first cause of offence, and afterwards to one of the best deaneries in the kingdom.† This pardon of the offender was the more generous, for the destruction of the paper containing the votes gave Laud considerable annoyance and trouble. His opponents seized the opportunity of

* Cyp. Ang., p. 56. † Cyp. Ang., p. 57.

appealing to the king. This step was taken with the greater confidence by his adversaries, because they were aware of Archbishop Abbot's continued dislike of Laud; and, as it was reported that the king's mind was now taking a Calvinistic bias, it was generally supposed that the archbishop's influence with his majesty would cause him to disallow the election of the new President of St. John's.

Appeal to the king.

The case was first heard by the Bishop of Winchester, when his lordship's judgment was in favour of Laud. When the appeal was made to the king, James enjoyed the discussion which ensued, and which lasted three hours, but he disappointed the appellants by confirming the judgment of the Bishop of Winchester.

Laud confirmed in his headship, and made king's chaplain.

Laud made a favourable impression on the royal mind by the manner in which he conducted this affair; and the king listened to the recommendation of Bishop Neile, and appointed the President of St. John's one of his chaplains.*

A royal chaplaincy in those days almost always led to high ecclesiastical preferment; but if such were Laud's expectations he was doomed to disappointment. His, however, was not the vulgar ambition which would seek personal distinction for the indulgence of vanity and pride. He was an isolated man, with no children, no wife, and had lost the friends of his childhood who would have sympathised and rejoiced in his successes. But he desired power. He had seen how the cause of what he regarded as heresy had been supported in the University, and he desired power to enforce his principles beyond the confines of the University. He found that, by the influence of Abbot and others, he was not, for a time, admitted to the confidence of the king, and the chaplaincy was becoming a mere honorary distinction, and honour without work was not what he desired. He determined to resign, but

* Cyp. Ang., p. 59.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

was persuaded by Bishop Neile not thus to exclude himself from the Court, where his influence might at some period become beneficial.

The wisdom of Bishop Neile's advice soon became apparent. The king discovered that Abbot was simply a partisan, seeking the good of his party, not the real interests of the Church. Other friends appeared at Court who sympathised with Laud. The death of Lord Ellesmere also removed another opponent to his interests. Bishop Neile's patronage of him was marked, and gratefully acknowledged. Besides the prebend of Bugden, in Lincoln cathedral, Laud was addressed as Archdeacon of Huntingdon.*

Archdeacon of Huntingdon.

At length, when he had reached his forty-third year, the attention of the Court was directed towards him, and he was presented to the deanery of Gloucester; a deanery which had been impoverished, although its vacancy was occasioned by the death of a dean whose praise is still in all the churches, Dr. Field.

Dean of Gloucester.

In Gloucester cathedral everything was in a state of neglect. The fabric itself was falling into decay, and the worship was assimilated, as nearly as might be, to the service of a conventicle. So notorious, in short, were the irregularities which had long prevailed, that they had attracted the attention, and incurred the displeasure of the king. Under these circumstances Laud departed for Gloucester, urged not only by his own zeal and discretion, but by the strongest injunctions of his majesty to effect a searching enquiry into abuses, and a careful reformation. In obedience to the royal mandate the first measure of Laud was to assemble the chapter,† to lay before them his majesty's instructions. His next step was to procure their consent to two acts; the one for a speedy

Reformation effected.

* Laud's Diary, Dec. 1, 1615.

† Laud's Works, iv. pp. 233, 234.

reparation of the fabric; the other for removing the communion-table to the east end of the choir, and placing it against the wall, conformably to the usage of other cathedral or mother-churches.* He further recommended to the prebendaries, choir-men, choristers, and the under officers of the church, the practice of a reverent obeisance on entering the choir, according to the praiseworthy custom of the primitive times—a custom at that period generally observed in the chapels of the king, and of many among the first nobility in the land—a tradition of pre-Reformation times, which, in my own younger days, was still retained in the cathedrals of Winchester and Christ Church. The clergy readily acquiesced; but the difficulties with which Laud had still to contend were painful and numerous. The Bishop of Gloucester at that time was Dr. Miles Smith, who owed his advancement to his reputation for Hebrew learning, and to his useful labours as one of the translators of the Bible.† It is painful to reflect that one, who had such substantial claims to public respect, should be found in bitter opposition to the redress of the abuses which deformed his own cathedral. Such, however, was the fact. Bishop Smith, unhappily, was an inflexible Calvinist; and so determined was his resistance to the restoration of order, that, when he heard of the directions given by Laud, with consent of the chapter, for the removal of the communion-table, he vowed that, if the dean should persist in these proceedings, he would never again enter the church; and to this resolution it is said he adhered faithfully to the day of his death. The Puritans were always renowned for their pertinacity and intolerance; but that a bishop should remain for eight years—for Dr. Smith did not die till 1624—within sound of the church bell, and yet refuse to attend the services, because they were

* Wilkins' Conc., iv. p. 188. † Wood, Ath. Ox., ii. 359.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

not conducted according to his dictation, in a matter on which he had no right to dictate, is to those who regard the worship of God as above all party spirit, a matter "passing strange."

Excitement of the populace at Gloucester.

The populace was excited, for the citizens of Gloucester were much infected with Puritanism. They had, in consequence of the neglect of the cathedral clergy, lost their allegiance to the Church. The cry of "No Popery" was raised, and Laud was denounced at Gloucester, as he had been at Oxford, as an incorrigible Papist. A libellous letter was written by a chaplain of Bishop Smith, one John White,* and widely disseminated. The uproar that this letter caused was so great that some of the dispersers thereof, being brought before an alderman of the city and justice of the peace,† were committed to prison, and a threat was held over others that they would be bound to their good behaviour. The alderman further advised that the whole matter should be referred to the High Commission Court.

A full report of these proceedings was sent to the dean by Henry Aisgill and Elias Wrench, two of the prebendaries, and by Thomas Prior, the sub-dean.‡

Laud thereupon wrote to the bishop the following letter:—

Laud's letter to the Bp. of Gloucester.

"My Lord,—My love and service remembered unto your lordship; When I came to do my duty to his majesty at Christmas, it seemed by the speech he uttered to me, that somebody had done the poor church of Gloucester no very good office. For his majesty was graciously pleased to tell me, he was informed that there was scarce ever a church in England so ill

* Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 75, 76.

† The alderman's name was Jones. He seems to have been firm, and not to have given way to the popular faction. Cyp. Ang., p. 65.

‡ Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 76.

governed, and so much out of order; and withal required me in general, to reform and set in order what I there found amiss. Hereupon, at my being at Gloucester, I acquainted the chapter with that which his majesty had said to me, and required at my hands; and took as good order (as in so short a space I could) both for the repair of some parts of the edifice of the church, and for redress of other things amiss. Among the rest, not rashly and of myself, but by a chapter act, I removed the communion-table from the middle of the quire to the upper end, the place appointed to it, both by the Injunctions of this Church, and by the practice of all the king's majesty's chapels, and all other cathedral churches in the kingdom which I have seen. This act, since my coming here (as I am by letters informed) is very much traduced by some in the city, and a libel against it laid in the pulpit of St. Michael's (where Master Sub-dean preaches), to the great scandal of the Church, and the laws established. Good my lord, let me desire this favour at your lordship's hands, that these things may be ordered, and that your lordship will join to reform such tongues and pens as know not how to submit to any law but their own. I must upon this of force have his gracious majesty acquainted both with the thing itself, and the entertainment which it hath found among turbulent spirits. And I presume his majesty will be well pleased to hear that your lordship, as in other things so in this, is careful to preserve order, and peace after it, in the Church. Thus not doubting but your lordship will be careful to rectify what is amiss, I for this time (being full of my business for Scotland) humbly take my leave, and shall ever rest your lordship's in all love and service." *

A few days later Laud, fearing lest the Puritans should

* Laud's Works, vol vi. pt. 1, p. 239.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

publish such a garbled report of his proceedings, as, if it fell into Abbot's hands, would be employed to the injury, not only of himself but of the cause he had at heart, addressed a letter to the Bishop of Lincoln. Having stated what he had done to reform the crying abuses of the cathedral church at Gloucester, he sends a copy of the libellous letter to his lordship, and concludes:—

His letter to the Bp. of Lincoln.

"I beseech your lordship, let me have your lawful assistance, that so long as I do nothing but that which is established and practised in our Church, I may not be brought into contempt, at my first entrance upon that place, by any turbulent spirits, and so disenabled to do that good service which I owe to the Church of God. And if it stand with your lordship's liking, I will humbly desire that his gracious majesty might know what successes I have in beginning to reform what I have found amiss in that place. In the close of our sub-dean's letter, your lordship shall see a strange monster, lately born in that city of Gloucester. I pray God the Puritans, which swarm in those parts, do not say it was one of God's judgments for turning the communion-table into an altar. I would have waited upon your lordship for all my business, and have brought these papers myself, but that I am unable at this time by sickness to come out of my chamber." *

Success at Glou cester.

At length by his consistency and firmness, Laud succeeded; and before the end of the year, although the bishop was persistent in his opposition, things were done decently and in order in Gloucester Cathedral.

While he was thus reforming the abuses of his cathedral, Laud's active mind was at work with regard to his University.

State of things at Oxford.

The state of discipline at Oxford appears to have been

* Laud's Works, vol. vi. pt. 1, p. 241.

at a very low ebb, and those who were not engaged in bitter controversy on the subject of Arminianism and Calvinism, were much given to strong beer. Archbishop Bancroft, as Chancellor of the University as well as Visitor of All Souls College, had before this written a letter to the warden, in which he says, "It is astonishing the kind of beer which heretofore you have had in your college, and hath been some cause of your decrements; for redress whereof I do strictly charge you by all the authority I have in that behalf, that from henceforth there be received no other into your buttery, or spent in commons at your college charge, but either small or middle beer; drink of higher rates being fitter for tippling-houses. And what I order herein, I mean (God willing) to see effected very shortly throughout the whole university."*

Excess in drinking prohibited by Abbot, and by Laud.

This extreme joviality, this delight in gaudies, and feasts, and strong beer, mentioned by Wood,† was also the subject of several letters from Archbishop Abbot,‡ but all these remonstrances had but little effect. Although Bancroft, and subsequently Laud, endeavoured to restrain the prevalent vice equally with Abbot, yet the members of their party were associated in the minds of the people generally with the excesses which were well known to exist, while to the Puritans was assigned, in public opinion, the praise of stricter morality and religion.

Intemperate preaching by Dr. Robert Abbot.

Doubtless Dr. Robert Abbot, the elder brother of the archbishop, Master of Balliol College, and afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, was not given to strong beer; but he, though a moderate man, encouraged, by his example, another abuse, that of preaching violently against those from whose opinions he differed. Of this we have an instance in the sermon he preached at St. Mary's on the first Sunday after Easter, 1614. Laud being present,

* Letter of Bancroft, quoted by Professor Burrows in 'Worthies of All Souls,' p. 123. † Annals. ‡ Life of Abbot, p. 290.

CHAP. XXXIII. William Laud. 1633-45.

Dr. Robert Abbot, then vice-chancellor, abused him "sufficiently," for almost an hour. "Some," he said, "are partly Romish, partly English, as occasion serves them, so that a man might say to them, *Noster es, an adversariorum?* who, under pretence of truth, and preaching against the Puritan, strike at the heart and root of the faith and religion now established amongst us. If they do at any time speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it. In the points of free will, justification, concupiscence being a sin after baptism, inherent righteousness, and certainty of salvation, the Papists beyond the seas can say that they are wholly theirs; and the recusants at home make their brags of them. And in all things they keep themselves so near the brink, that upon any occasion they may step over to them. Now for this speech, that the Presbyterians are as bad as the Papists, there is a sting in the speech which I wish had been left out; for there are many churches beyond the seas which contend for the religion established among us, and yet have approved and admitted the Presbytery."

The sermon was a vindication of Presbyterianism; but not content with this, the preacher pointed at Laud in his seat, and addressed him at the end thus:—

"Might not Christ say, 'What art thou, Romish or English? Papist or Protestant? Or what art thou? a mongrel, or compound of both? A Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of free will, inherent righteousness, and the like? A Protestant in receiving the sacrament, a Papist in the doctrine of the sacrament? What! do you think there are two heavens? If there be, get you to the other, and place yourselves there, for into this where I am, ye shall not come.'" *

* Cyp. Ang., p. 62.

Laud had been preaching on the subject of Presbyterianism, and seeing that the Puritan faction was still so strong in the University, he must have expected to be answered. He had not, however, expected an attack so bitter as that which was now directed against him. He bore it with patience, and the more readily as he no longer stood alone. Other men of eminence had risen in the University who had been roughly handled in Puritanic sermons. He was content to bear the sneers and scoffs of those who, thinking differently, thought themselves wise.

Directions procured in consequence.

But this custom of preaching against one another now prevailed to such an extent, that Laud, in 1616, with the other clergy about the Court, procured directions from the king for the better government of the University, which was virtually a condemnation of the Calvinistic tenets then prevalent. The directions ordered that all who should take any degree in schools should subscribe to the three articles in the thirty-sixth canon; that no preacher should be allowed to preach in the town but such as were every way conformable, both by subscription and every other way; that all students should resort to the sermons in St. Mary's and be restrained from going to any other church in the time of St. Mary's sermons, and that the sermons in St. Mary's should be diligently made and performed, both before noon and after noon; that the ordinary Divinity Act should be constantly kept with three replicants; that there should be a greater restraint of scholars haunting town houses, especially in the night; that all scholars, both at the chapels and at the schools, should keep their scholastic habits; that young students in divinity should be directed to study such books as are most agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England, and incited to bestow their time in studying the Fathers and Councils, schoolmen, histories, and controversies, and not to insist too long upon compendiums and abbreviatures,

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

making them the grounds of their study in divinity; that no man, either in pulpit or schools, should be suffered to maintain dogmatically any point of doctrine that is not allowed by the Church of England; that the vice-chancellor and the two professors, or two of the heads of houses, should, at such time as his majesty resorted into those parts, wait upon him, and give his majesty a just account how these instructions were carried out; and, lastly, that no man should presume, of what degree or condition soever, not to yield his obedience to these his majesty's directions, lest he incur such censures as the statutes of the University may inflict.* These were despatched on the 18th of January, 1616, and however wise they may have been, considered in the abstract, that they were an unjust exertion of the royal authority there can be no doubt.

King James having, in his own opinion, secured unity of doctrine at Oxford, now set out on his visit to Scotland, accompanied by Bishops Neile, Montague, and Andrewes,† with Laud as chaplain. This appointment shows that Laud had overcome that prejudice against himself which, at one time, existed in the royal breast.

Laud chaplain to King James on his visit to Scotland.

The king rested at Lincoln; and from this place are dated the instructions to the ambassador in Spain, with regard to the espousals of Prince Charles and the Infanta. The espousals were to be in Spain, according to the order of the Council of Trent, but the marriage was to be solemnized in England, according to the laws of the realm; in which order Heylyn thinks that he can discover the hand and spirit of Laud, though the event took place in the primacy of Abbot.

James evidently entertained some fears as to his reception in Scotland, and as to the treatment he was likely to

* Cyp. Ang., p. 66. Wood, Ann., vol. ii. pt. 1, p. 323.

† Nichols' Progresses of King James, iii. p. 245.

meet with from the Puritan zealots. He determined not to attend the Calvinistic conventicles; nor would he listen to the extemporaneous effusions of the Calvinistic preachers. He consequently despatched commissioners to Scotland to repair the chapel royal at the palace of Holyrood House, in order that the public worship might be conducted according to the ritual of the Church of England. When the works began, the report spread, and was fostered by the preachers, that mass was about to be introduced. The Scottish bishops were alarmed at the arrangements made, and the ornaments adopted in the chapel. Instead of seeking to disarm suspicion and to appease their wrath, the king offended their pride and inflamed their passions, by reproving them for their narrow views, and by promising to bring with him some English theologians to enlighten their minds.

Chapel of Holyrood House repaired.

The malcontents, however, at this time, failed. When, on the 13th of May, the King arrived in his ancient kingdom, he was received with every demonstration of joy. King James was filled with delight; he showed off his learning before the Scotch Universities; he exhibited his bad taste in witticisms which caused women to blush, and courtiers to laugh or to sneer; and he offended the professors by making puns on their names.*

Enthusiastic reception of James.

Through the influence of Abbot, the moderators of the Scottish Assemblies were permitted to assume the title, and, in some measure the rank, of bishops; but the Calvinistic theories remained untouched, and the liturgy had not been accepted. The king wished to act, but knew not how to proceed. He summoned and courted the Scottish parliament, against which the preachers protested, under the leadership of Simpson, Ewart, and Calderwood the historian. The sermons of the Pres-

James desires to introduce the English Liturgy.

* 'The Muse's Welcome to James,' Johnstone's Hist., p. 519. MS. in Library of Univ. Edin.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

byterians, in the parish churches, abounded with invectives against the king. James, in his private chapels, was secured against the insults he had formerly received; but the English prelates, by whom James was attended, not only heard the king publicly censured, they were also obliged to listen to the condemnation of the rites and ceremonies of the English Church. They reported what they heard to the king, but at this time, says Heylyn, there was no remedy; the Scots were Scots, and were resolved to go their own way.*

Spirit of the Scotch Presbyterians.

Presbyterianism had been established in Scotland by bloodshed, violence, and rapine, and the Catholic Church had been entirely overthrown. Bad as had been the moral state of the country in the later days of Catholicism, and amply as the Church of Scotland needed reform, things were worse after the ascendancy of Presbyterianism. A more lamentable state of things can scarcely be imagined. The needy and avaricious nobles had appropriated the property of the Church, leaving only a pittance for the support of the ministry, and the ministers, therefore, became to a certain extent dependent on the charity of the people. Religion was made the pretext for insurrection; the principles of Christianity were forgotten; Protestantism, like Mohammedanism, was propagated at the point of the sword. If we censure the spirit of persecution in the divines of Henry and Mary, we must in justice denounce the same spirit, when it displayed itself in the Knoxes and the Melvilles. James was well aware of the principles of the Scottish preachers, and desired the re-introduction of the Catholic Church, not in its former state of corruption, but as it was reformed after the model of the Church of England. In 1612 episcopacy, as the first step, had been re-established by Abbot.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 74.

But the king knew well that episcopacy is only one ingredient in Catholicism, and he went to Scotland with the full determination of establishing the whole Catholic system. This is evident from the Articles, imposed by James, known as the 'Articles of Perth.' They are five in number, and are as follows:—

Articles of Perth imposed.

1. That for the more reverend receiving of Holy Communion, the same should be administered to the people, thereafter, kneeling, and not sitting, as had been the custom since the reformation of religion.

2. If any good Christian, visited with sickness which was taken to be deadly, should desire to receive the communion at home in his house, the same should not be denied to him, lawful warning being given to the minister the night before, and three or four of good religion and conversation being present to communicate with him.

3. That in case of necessity tried and known to the minister, it should be lawful to administer baptism in private houses, the same being always ministered after the form in which it should have been in the congregation. A public declaration of it to be made the next Sunday after.

4. That the days of the Birth, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Saviour Christ, and of the coming down of the Holy Ghost, in regard of those inestimable benefits which the Church of God had received on them, should be publicly solemnized in the congregation, the ministers making choice of fit texts of Scripture, agreeable to the occasion, for their several sermons.

5. That the minister in every parish, having catechized all children above eight years of age, according to the short Catechism used in the Church, and taught them to repeat by heart the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, should present them to their bishops in their visitations, by them to be blessed with prayers for the

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

increase of grace and continuance of God's heavenly gifts.*

Laud fully believed with James, as the king in these propositions observed, that to regulate the polity of the Church in his own realms was the prerogative and duty of a Christian king; but it does not appear, and it is not probable, that James, surrounded as he was by prelates, Scotch and English, was under the influence of his chaplain. The object of James and his advisers was to bring the Scottish Church to a conformity with the Church of England, so that in one island he hoped to see established one kingdom, and in that one kingdom the same branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. In despair as to what he should do, James held an interview with the Scottish prelates, and by their advice granted to the preachers an Assembly, in which, however, he took measures to ensure a compliance with his own will.

The preachers' salaries withheld.

When the Assembly met, the recalcitrant Puritans found that instead of the argumentation, in which they delighted, and by means of which they expected to obtain a triumph over the king, practical measures were to be adopted, and the salaries to the preachers, which had been paid out of the royal exchequer, were to be withheld. This had a considerable effect, upon many who depended upon their salaries for their livelihood; and though the measure may seem to have been a hard one, yet the Presbyterians could not expect to receive the royal bounty, and yet act in direct opposition to the royal desire. If they appealed to their religious scruples, the king could do the same, and decline to support those who totally rejected the call to union, and who refused to accept the doctrines of the Church of England, which James, as sovereign, felt himself bound to uphold.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 72.

The king felt deeply the contempt with which his authority was treated, and he was glad to set out on his return to England.

As soon as his majesty had departed, the Assembly, according to his promise, was convened at St. Andrew's; but little or nothing was done, despite the efforts of Archbishop Spottiswoode, who was most indefatigable in his exertions for the Church. The bishops held back, dreading the power of the Presbyterians, and they incurred thereby great resentment from the king. But, probably, they were wise in thus temporizing, for otherwise the bitterness of spirit, resulting from the withholding of the preachers' salaries, might have defeated their object. They demanded from the Presbyterians that nothing should be done till another Assembly was called. That Assembly was duly convened, and is known in history by the name of the Perth Assembly, as in that town the deliberations were held. Most of the nobility and gentry of the land, all the bishops with one exception, namely, the Bishop of Argyll, the commissioners appointed by the king, and the ministers who had been elected by the Presbyterians, attended, and a sermon was preached at the opening of the Assembly by Archbishop Spottiswoode. The archbishop was by no means a favourite of King James, but he was a staunch upholder of the Church, and he defended, on this occasion, the ritual and discipline of the Church of England with considerable ability. His sermon was listened to with attention, but when he proceeded from the pulpit to occupy the moderator's chair, an opposition was raised to his presidency. To this he replied, that as the assembly was held within his diocese, he should occupy the chair, and as long as he lived no one should take his place. He gained his point by his firmness, and the dicussion proceeded. There was not, however, any great opposition to the matter in hand, and

Assembly of St. Andrew's.

Assembly at Perth.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

when a letter from the king had been presented by the Dean of Winchester, the five Articles were after a short debate carried by a large majority,* and from henceforth they formed part of the ritual of the Scottish Church. This was the last Assembly held in the reign of James, and such was the result of the negotiations carried on by the king for two years. The historians of the time seemed to be unanimous in their opinion, that the opposition of the Calvinists would have been so great as to have changed the majority, if the king had not withheld the payment of their stipends. The validity of the proceedings was afterwards called in question by the Presbyterians, but everyone who has carefully examined the subject appears now to be convinced that the Assembly was legally summoned, and that it was composed of the representatives of the nation. The attempt to enforce the Articles soon proved a failure. Christmas Day was not observed, and the Eucharist was not received kneeling. Equally disregarded were the festivals of the Church. According to Spottiswoode the opponents were, in Edinburgh, encouraged by the magistrates,† and they were always supported by the nobles, who were alarmed lest they should be called upon to refund the alienated property of the Church.

The five Articles are passed.

They proved a failure.

This was the last attempt in the reign of James to restore the Church in Scotland.

The conduct of Laud has been so generally misrepresented in all that relates to Scotland, that I shall disregard the claims of chronology in this instance, in order that the reader may have Laud's own history of the facts of the case as we find it in the History of his Troubles and Trial. Laud's principles would have induced him to

* Spottiswoode, p. 534. Calderwood's History, p. 691.

† Spottiswoode, p. 540.

sacrifice much to procure a uniform system of religion in the three kingdoms, over which the King of England reigned; failing this we should not expect him to take much interest in the course of affairs which occurred in Scotland.

Laud's own account of Scottish affairs.

Writing in the time of King Charles, Laud positively denies that he laboured to introduce into the kingdom of Scotland, any innovations in religion or government: "and because," he says, "so much noise hath been made against me, both in the Scottish charge before answered, and in this article about popish innovations in that Service-book, and that I laboured the introducing both of it and them; I think it fit, if not necessary, to set down briefly the story of what was done, and what I did, and by what command, in all that business."

And it follows:—"Dr. John Maxwell, the late Bishop of Ross, came to me from his majesty; it was during the time of a great and dangerous fever, under which I then laboured; it was in the year 1629, in August or September, which, come that time, is thirteen years since. The cause of his coming was to speak with me about a liturgy for Scotland. At his coming I was so extreme ill that I saw him not; and had death (which I then expected daily, as did my friends and physicians also) seized on me, I had not seen this heavy time. After this, when I was able to sit up, he came to me again, and told me it was his majesty's pleasure that I should receive instructions from some bishops of Scotland concerning a liturgy for that Church; and that he was employed from my Lord the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and other prelates there, about it. I told him I was clear of opinion, that if his majesty would have a liturgy settled there, it were best to take the English Liturgy without any variation, that so, the same Service-book might be established in all his majesty's dominions; which I did then,

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

and do still think, would have been a great happiness to this State, and a great honour and safety to religion.

"To this he replied that he was of a contrary opinion; and that not he only but the bishops of that kingdom thought their countrymen would be much better satisfied if a liturgy were framed by their own clergy, than to have the English Liturgy put upon them; yet he added that it might be according to the form of our English Service-book.

"I answered to this, that if this were the resolution of my brethren the bishops of Scotland, I would not entertain so much as thoughts about it till I might, by God's blessing, have health and opportunity to wait upon his majesty and receive his further directions from himself.

"When I was able to go abroad, I came to his majesty and represented all that had passed. His majesty avowed the sending of Dr. Maxwell to me, and the message sent by him; but then inclined to my opinion to have the English Service without any alteration to be established there. And in this condition I held that business for two if not three years at least. Afterwards the Scottish bishops still pressing his majesty, that a liturgy framed by themselves, and in some few things different from ours, would relish better with their countrymen, they at last prevailed with his majesty to have it so, and carried it against me, notwithstanding all I could do or say to the contrary.

"Then his majesty commanded me to give the bishops of Scotland my best assistance in this way and work. I delayed as much as I could with my obedience; and when nothing would serve but it must go on, I confess I was then very serious and gave them the best help I could. But wheresoever I had any doubt I did not only acquaint his majesty with it, but writ down most of the amendments or alterations in his majesty's presence.

And I do verily believe, there is no one thing in that book which may not stand with the conscience of a right good Protestant. Sure I am his majesty approved them all; and I have his warrant under his royal hand for all that I did about that book. And to the end the book may be extant, and come to the view of the Christian world, and their judgment of it be known, I have caused it to be exactly translated into Latin; and if right be done, it shall be printed with this history.

"This was that which I did concerning the matter and substance of this Service-book. As for the way of introducing it, I ever advised the bishops, both in his majesty's presence and at other times, both by word and by writing, that they would look carefully to it, and be sure to do nothing about it but what should be agreeable to the laws of that kingdom; and that they should at all times be sure to take the advice of the lords of his majesty's council in that kingdom, and govern themselves and their proceedings accordingly: which course if they have not followed, that can in no way reflect upon me, who have, both in this and all things else, been as careful of their laws as any man that is a stranger to them could be. And in a letter of mine after my last coming out of Scotland, thus I wrote to the late reverend Archbishop of St. Andrews, September 30, 1633, concerning the liturgy; that, whether that of England or another were resolved on, yet they should proceed circumspectly; 'because his majesty had no intendment to do anything but that which was according to honour and justice, and the laws of that kingdom:' and a copy of this letter I have yet by me to show; and for the truth of this narration, I know his majesty, and my Lord Ross himself, will avow it.

"And here I take leave to acquaint the reader, that this was no new conceit of his majesty, to have a liturgy framed and canons made for the Church of Scotland;

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

for he followed his royal father King James his example and care therein, who took order for both at the Assembly of Perth, an. 1618." *

The reader may see from this historical statement made by Laud himself, that the surmise already made to the effect that the chaplain of King James was not consulted by his Majesty in his Scotch affairs is correct. Laud would have stated the fact, had he been admitted into the counsels of the king. He was in Scotland the chaplain who would fearlessly carry out all the principles and arrangements of the English Liturgy in the royal chapels, but he was evidently not officially consulted.

Sabbatarian controversy.

James returned to England disappointed at the reception he had met with in his native land; but as he crossed the border he felt he was once more a king. The object of his English courtiers was to meet his views and to win his favour; and most certainly this had not been the inclination of those who, in Scotland, could hardly be called courtiers, though they attended his Court. Yet, even in England, the Puritans were prepared to give him trouble, and certain orders he issued concerning the allowance of sports on the Lord's Day, were the first cause of disturbance.

Although I have touched on the subject in the life of

* 'History of Troubles and Trial,' Laud's Works, Anglo-Cath. Theol., iii. p. 426. Prynne (Hidden Works, p. 156) gives the warrant issued to Laud by King Charles for the alteration in the Scottish Prayer Book.

"CHARLES R.

"I gave the Archbishop of Canterbury command to make the alterations expressed in this book, and to fit a Liturgy for the Church of Scotland. And wheresoever they shall differ from another book, signed by us at Hampton Court, September 28, 1634, our pleasure is, to have these followed rather than the former, unless the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and his brethren who are upon the place, shall see apparent reason to the contrary. At Whitehall, April 19, 1636."

Abbot, I revert to the origin of this controversy, because it will show that it was not to Laud, as is sometimes supposed to be the case, that the publication of the Book of Sports is to be attributed. That he agreed with the king in the view taken of the Sabbath is certain; but the controversy was raised long before Laud was, himself, concerned in it.

The Sabbatarian question.

The Puritans had refused to receive as law anything that could not be proved from the Bible. They looked in vain to the Bible for authority for an observance of Sunday. The first day of the week was kept holy by an order of the Church, enforced by the law of the land. Having refused to abide by the ecclesiastical laws, they assumed, what can never be proved, that the Lord's Day, the Christian festival, superseded the Sabbath mentioned in Scripture; and then they applied to the Lord's Day all the Sabbatarian doctrine that they found in any part of the Bible. It had not been so in the primitive times, when the Saturday Sabbath was for some time continued as a fast, while the Lord's Day was kept as a festival. In the early days of the Reformation, the great reformer Whitgift was accustomed to keep his festivals on the Lord's Day, hospitality being regarded as a duty devolving upon the Lord's servants. On the feasts of Easter and Whitsuntide he magnificently entertained the members of the county, the courtiers of Elizabeth—even the queen herself; and it is mentioned to his praise that, before engaging in these entertainments, he made a point of first celebrating the Holy Eucharist, and partaking of that banquet of heavenly food in the metropolitan church of Canterbury. Anyone desirous of receiving an impartial contemporary account of the rise of the Sabbatarian controversy, which we have touched upon before, may be referred to Heylyn, not only in his *Cyprianus Anglicus*, but in a work he wrote expressly on the subject.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

Evasion of authority by the Puritans.

The Sabbatarian "doctrines" had at first been crushed by the diligence of Archbishop Whitgift and the severity of Justice Popham; but afterwards, without the countenance of authority, they obtained a footing in divers places by the piety or superstition of the Puritans, the ignorant confidence of some of their lecturers, and the well-intentioned zeal of some public ministers of justice. They prevailed so far, at last, that the annual festivals having, on account of their abuse, been abolished, and many saints' days having been converted into days of labour, while the Lord's Day was devoted to religious duties, there was no time left for lawful recreation and the physical training of the people.* The Papists made capital of this Sabbatarian doctrine, alleging that, according to it, the Protestant religion was inconsistent with all harmless and modest recreation.

It was, says the author of the Life of Bishop Morton, "no small policy in the leaders of the popish party to keep the people from church by dancing and other recreation, even in the time of divine service, especially on holydays, and the Lord's Day in the afternoon. By which means they kept the people in ignorance and lukewarmness, and so made them the more capable to be wrought upon by their emissaries;" which gross abuse the bishop endeavoured to redress in his primary visitation. But it was represented to King James on his return out of Scotland through Lancashire in 1617, as a grievance, if not an intolerable hardship. This readiness of James to hear any complaint against the appearance of a public grievance, encouraged some persons to so much boldness the next Lord's Day after, as, even to disturb the public worship and service of God by their piping and dancing within the hearing of all those that were at church. Of this, when the king was fully in-

* Heylyn, p. 71.

formed by the bishop, he utterly disavowed any thought or intention of encouraging such profaneness; and therefore left them that were guilty of it to the bishop's censure. The censure he administered only to one person who was the head and causer of the disturbance. There wanted not other persons still to complain to the king of the bishop's proceedings herein as rigorous and tyrannical, considering that the chief thing they desired was only innocent recreation for servants and other inferior people on the Lord's Day, and holydays, whose laborious callings deprived them of it at all other times; and thereupon to solicit his majesty for some power therein, and the rather because it was the general desire of most of that country. The king, upon enquiry finding this opinion to prevail, and being willing to give satisfaction to the labouring poor, consulted with this reverend person, being the bishop of that diocese, how he might satisfy their desires without endangering this liberty to be turned into licentiousness. The bishop, hereupon, retiring from the Court at Haughton Tower, to his own lodging at Preston, considered of six limitations or restrictions, by way of condition, to be imposed upon every man who should avail himself of the liberty conceded. This, the next day, he presented to the king in writing. The king approved of the proposed conditions, and added a seventh: saying only, he would alter them from the words of a bishop to the words of a king. It is not to be omitted, that Bishop Andrewes attended the king officially at the same time, and therefore was in all probability consulted on the matter. The advice of such a wise and learned prelate would have great weight. "All that I can positively say, in the business," continues the biographer of Morton, "is what I have here said, and this I can positively say, because I have often heard it from the bishop's own mouth. All the

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

arguments I could ever yet see urged against the lawfulness of what is permitted by this declaration, taking it as it is still, and ever was, restrained by these limitations and conditions, are grounded upon no other bottom for the most part, than the bare name of Sabbath, as it is applied or misapplied to the Lord's Day." *

Royal declaration on the Sabbatarian controversy.

The declaration adopted by James and issued in his name, bore date at Greenwich, May 24, 1618, and contained the reasons why some order of this sort was required; a description of what, in the way of recreations might be done on the Lord's Day, and certain restrictions to prevent abuses in the matter.

The reasons for it.

The reasons are clearly stated. Certain preachers and ministers of justice were too strict and rigorous in preventing innocent and healthy recreations; the conversion of papists was thereby hindered, men were likely to become inactive, and "unfit for warriors," if debarred on their holyday from man-like exercises; tippling-houses would be encouraged, and sedition talked over the beer-cups if men were excluded from these open pastimes. Manly exercises were allowed; nor were May games, Whitsun-ales, Morris dances, and the setting up of Maypoles forbidden. But the term "lawful recreation" did not include bear-baiting, or bull-baiting, or interludes, or bowling, which were at all times forbidden to the lower classes. These pastimes were not to be an impediment to the duties of the day, neither were they to be carried on during the time of divine service. No recusant, and no person who had not been present at the time of all divine offices, or who was not a parishioner, should have the benefit of these recreations. †

The liberties to be allowed.

The restrictions to be imposed.

In these days some portions of this declaration would be considered hard and intolerant, but when we remember

* Life of Bishop Morton, p. 80. † Wilkins.

the spirit of those times, and that the Puritans were striving, in an intolerant manner on their part, to bring the people into subjection to their own exclusive views of religious duty, we can understand, that it may have been necessary on the part of the king and his advisers to uphold in so strict a manner the services of the Church.

Laud accused of upholding the Sabbath-breakers.

Laud was accused by the Puritans of being an upholder of the "Sabbath-breakers," and his views on the subject of lawful recreations on the Lord's Day were well known. It may be reasonably supposed that, being thrown much together at this time, he and his friend Bishop Andrewes had discussed the matter, and were upon it agreed. But Laud was not with the king during his progress "thorow Lancashire," and so was not present when Bishop Morton drew up the sketch of the declaration. He was not the author or origin of the movement.

His duties in Scotland must have been very trying to a man of Laud's character. He was not as yet at the head of affairs; and he desired more active employment than that which pertained to a royal chaplaincy, when the chaplain, instead of being admitted to the royal confidence, had to attend merely to the discharge of routine duties. Glad was he therefore when he obtained the king's permission to visit Oxford, and his much-loved home, the college of St. John's. Here he was welcomed right cordially by the Church party, which almost owed its existence to his firmness and learning, and to his patronage of learning in others. His heart, too, rejoiced in the good news that reached him from Gloucester. He learned that, in answer to his exertions and prayers, the Puritan enthusiasm had been restrained, and the services of the cathedral were still performed with that devotion and solemnity he had been so anxious to maintain.

He visits Oxford.

Presented to Ibstock rectory.

Laud, being presented by the Bishop of Rochester to the rectory of Ibstock in Leicestershire, resigned his

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

living of Norton. He was inducted into his new benefice on the 2nd of August, 1617; but he did not reside there, or remain a longer time than sufficient to put things in decent order, and see after the wants of the poor, according to his usual custom.

resigning Norton.

He returned to Oxford, requiring rest and peace, but rest and peace were not for him. Under the staircase of the chaplain's chamber at St. John's a fire broke out * and spread in the direction of the library, in which Laud had already placed many valuable works. The president himself was in some danger. Prynne remarks that he was near being burnt "for his sins." † To these so-called sins he now added another which inflamed the passions of the Puritanical party; he erected in St. John's College Chapel an organ of considerable size. Towards the expense of this instrument Sir William Paddy had contributed; and by will he provided the salary of the organist, and endowed the choral service.‡ It is a curious fact that, though a great deal of attention was drawn to this organ by the Puritans, and it was considered a proof decisive of Laud's popish tendencies, yet it escaped destruction in the Great Rebellion, and continued in use till the year 1768.

Fire in St. John's college.

Laud erects an organ in St. John's Chapel.

At this time Laud's health, never very good, appears to have broken down. The cares, disappointments, and annoyances he had encountered in Scotland, and the various troubles awaiting him on his return to England, had an effect on his delicate constitution. He had occasion to visit London, but soon returned to Oxford, and he records that as he was passing from London towards Oxford, he rested at an inn in the village of Wickham, or Wycombe, on the road, where he suddenly fell down, in a fit of such intensity and long continuance, that it was

* Diary, Sept. 26, 1617.

† Breviat, p. 30.

‡ Wood's Hist. of Colleges and Halls, pp. 541, 554.

not without much difficulty, and God's special favour, that he was restored to his former being. Laud thus refers to this seizure in his Diary :*—

"I fell '*suddenly dead*,' for a time, at Wickham on my return from London."

King James's illness,

To similar causes—over-work and over-anxiety—we may, perhaps, attribute a serious illness which befel the king at Newmarket. On his recovery James appears to have been deeply impressed by the thought of his late danger. He determined to return thanks at St. Paul's, for the mercies he had received. Of this solemn ceremonial the account is important, for it refutes the vulgar notion that Laud disturbed the peace of the Church by the introduction of a novel ceremonial. We find here that, before Laud had authority to control public affairs, (while he was yet only a presbyter of the Church), the services of the cathedral had continued as they had been left from the time of Henry VIII. On Mid-Lent Sunday in the year 1620, accompanied by the prince, and attended by the Marquis of Buckingham, by two bishops, by the Lords, and by the principal gentlemen of the Court, the king visited St. Paul's. From Temple Bar he was conducted, in most solemn manner, by the lord mayor and aldermen of London, and at his entrance into the cathedral he was received under a canopy by the dean and canons, attired in rich copes and other ecclesiastical habits. The service was ornate, and the choir, which was composed of such excellent voices as seemed rather to "enchant than chant," was accompanied not only by the organ, but by cornets and sackbuts. The sermon was preached at the cross by the Bishop of London, Dr. King. At the conclusion a sumptuous banquet was provided by the prelate, which the king honoured by his

and thanksgiving for recovery at St. Paul's.

* Diary, April 2, 1619.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

presence.* A restoration of the dilapidated cathedral suggested itself to the royal mind, and soon after, the king issued a commission for the carrying out the restoration. Bishop King and Bishop Montaigne both of them did somewhat towards this restoration, but no great advance in the work was made until the year 1631. Then another commission being issued by King Charles, Laud, who had become Bishop of London, devoted his energies to the work with signal success.

Death of the Queen.

The death of the queen, which followed that of Henry, Prince of Wales, had no doubt a favourable influence on the future history of William Laud, for she was the chief supporter of Abbot, and had little regard to the welfare of her husband's subjects. With her death Archbishop Abbot's interest at Court declined, and James was made to perceive the malevolence of those who had studiously endeavoured to keep Laud from his notice and to ruin his reputation.

Preferment was now in store for Laud, and the king told him as much, when he was pleased to say, that he had given him nothing but Gloucester, which he well knew was a shell without a kernel.

He is installed prebendary of Westminster.

On the 22nd of January, 1620, Laud was installed prebendary of Westminster, and it was generally reported at Court that he was to obtain the deanery of that church. Dr. Williams, the dean, on the death of Dr. King, Bishop of London, had made application for, and was very desirous to obtain, the vacant see; offering to give up the deanery of Westminster if appointed.† In this matter he was unsuccessful, but was presently nominated to the bishopric of Lincoln. His object, then, was to hold the deanery of Westminster, *in commendam*, together with his new appointment; and as the bishopric of St. David's at this

* Cyp. Ang., p. 76.

† Collection of Orig. Letters, i. p. 52. Letter xix. London, 1755.

time fell vacant by the translation of Dr. Milbourne to the see of Carlisle, Williams is said to have used his influence with the king to obtain it for Laud, fearing, if no other preferment was offered, he would be appointed to the deanery.* St. David's could be only regarded, in those days, as an honourable banishment. To Laud the deanery would have been more acceptable than any other preferment, but he accepted the bishopric of St. David's. But if Williams dreaded Laud's proximity to the Court, if he were made Dean of Westminster; and if he thought by sending him into Wales to deprive him of further interest with the King, he was, as we shall presently see, mistaken. It is not necessary for us to do more at present than to allude to the lasting quarrel which existed between these eminent men, but it is absurd to say that Laud was under any obligation to Williams for his bishopric and to accuse him of ingratitude.

Laud Bi-hop of St. David's.

Williams had always some object of personal ambition in view. His object now was to hold the deanery *in commendam*, or at all events, to prevent Laud's appointment thereto. Notwithstanding all opposition, Laud was summoned to preach before the Court, at Wanstead, on June 19, 1621; and he chose for his text Ps. cxxii. 6, 7. The sermon was much admired and highly appreciated.†

His sermon at Wanstead.

"Herewithal I send you," writes a Mr. Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, "a sermon of Dr. Laud's, on the king's birthday, because it is after the manner of the Bishop of Winchester (Andrewes's) preaching, and be-

* The biographer of Dr. Williams, in a detailed account, attributes his advocacy of Laud to disinterested motives—which was certainly not the case. He also asserts that the king was adverse to Laud's preferment, which is inconsistent with other statements of higher authority. Hacket, pp. 63, 64.

† Nichols' Progresses of King James, iv. p. 671. Birch, James I., ii. p. 27.

CHAP. XXXIII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

cause it touches the idle conceit of Serjeant Finch's book of the 'Calling of the Jews.'" *

The sermon was an elaborate and able disquisition on the duty of prayer for Church and State. The reference to King James would not be according to our ideas of good taste, but it was the fashion in those times to make such personal allusions in the pulpit. "Surely," said the preacher, "we have a Jerusalem, a State, and a Church to pray for; and this day was our Solomon, the very peace of our Jerusalem, born; and though he were not born among us, yet he was born to us, and for the good and welfare of both State and Church; and can you do other than *rogare pacem*, 'pray for peace,' in the day, nay nativity, the very birthday, of both Peace and Peacemaker?"

This is not worthy of Laud, but the conclusion of the sermon will show that he had a particular object in view.

"My exhortation therefore shall keep ever with St. Paul, that 'supplication and prayers be made,' especially, 'for kings, and for all that are in authority, that (under them) we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.' Here St. Paul would have you pray for the king; and in my text the king would have you pray for the State and the Church; his peace cannot be without theirs; and your peace cannot be without his. Thus, having made my text my circle, I am gone round it, and come back to it, and must therefore end in the point where I began: 'Pray for the peace of

* The book referred to was one which bore the name of William Gouge, B.D., but it was really written by Sir H. Finch. It contained several extraordinary theories with regard to the future of the Jews; and James, considering it anti-monarchical, was so fierce against Gouge, that he committed him to prison for nine weeks. Gouge afterwards became one of the trustees of the Impropriation Scheme, planned by the Puritans, and destroyed by Archbishop Laud. Gouge's Comm. on Heb. Life. London, 1655.

Jerusalem; let them prosper that love it; peace be within the walls of it, and prosperity within the palaces;' that the peace of God, which passeth our understanding here, may not leave us till it possesses us of eternal peace."

It must have been trying to Laud to have to preach before his majesty at Wanstead, for in this very chapel, many years before, he had married the Earl of Devonshire to Lady Rich; an unjustifiable action on his part, which he always regarded with humiliation and tears of penitence. The king had always looked upon that iniquitous marriage with abhorrence, and he was justly disinclined to show favour to any of those who had borne part in it. To this, indeed, is sometimes attributed the tardiness of Laud's promotion.

Consecrated Bishop of St. David's.

It was not till nearly five months after his nomination, that Laud was consecrated Bishop of St. David's, owing to the unfortunate accident which occurred to Archbishop Abbot, in shooting a keeper at Branzil Park, of which a full account has been given in the Life of Abbot.*

The bishops-elect were unwilling to receive consecration at the hands of Abbot, until he was acquitted of irregularity, and restored by the proper authority to the full exercise of his functions. At the request of the bishops-elect the king issued a commission to the Bishops of London, Oxford, Ely, Worcester, and Llandaff to act for the archbishop, and from them Dr. Laud received consecration, with Dr. Cary and Dr. Davenant, in the Bishop of London's chapel, on the 18th of November, 1621.

Resigns St. John's.

The king had granted permission to Bishop Laud to hold *in commendam* the place of President of St. John's College. But by the statutes he was forbidden to do so, and as he says, "by the reason of that statute, which I shall not violate, nor my oath to it under any colour, I am resolved before my consecration to leave it."

* See vol. ix. p. 280.

# CHAPTER XXXIV.

## LAUD'S EPISCOPATE.

Friendship between Laud and Buckingham.—Controversy with Fisher.—Refutation of Fisher written by Laud.—His anxiety about Buckingham.—Proposal to confiscate the Revenues of Charter House.—Opposed by Laud.—Business in Parliament.—Laud visits his Diocese.—His dreams.—His work.—His prayers.—Seditious preaching at Oxford.—The Royal Injunctions.—Consequent ferment among the Puritans.—Spanish journey of the Prince of Wales.—Breach between Williams and Laud.—Intimacy of Laud with Prince Charles.—Meeting of Convocation.—Death of King James.—Accession of Charles.—Attempts made to prejudice the King against Laud are unsuccessful.—Funeral of King James.—Arrival of Queen Henrietta Maria.—Consequences of the Royal Marriage.—Case of Dr. Mountague.—Proceedings against him revoked by the King. Parliament meets at Oxford.—Laud revisits his Diocese.—His ill-health.—Appointed Deputy Clerk of the Closet.—Royal letters against Papists and Puritans.—Letter to Buckingham on the birth of his son.—Preparations for the Coronation.—Laud to act as Dean of Westminster on the occasion.—The Coronation.—Attacks upon Laud for alleged alterations in the Ceremonial.—Second Parliament.—Attack on Mountague renewed.—Prosecution of Buckingham.—Laud accused of writing the Speeches for the King and Duke.—Goodman's Sermon.—His obstinacy.—Laud nominated Bishop of Bath and Wells.—Subsidies from Convocation required by the King, and instructions drawn up by Laud.—Death of Bishop Andrewes.—Laud succeeds as Dean of the Chapel Royal.—The cases of Sibthorpe and Mainwaring.—Laud the King's adviser during Buckingham's absence.—His translation to the See of London designed.—Failure of Buckingham at Rochelle.—Laud meets with an accident.—Heylyn's visit to him.—Laud preaches before the Third Parliament.—Attitude of the Commons on the Religious question.—The Remonstrance.—Answered by Laud.—His translation to London effected.—Murder of the Duke of Buckingham.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

AMONG the friendships formed by Laud at the Court of King James, the most surprising is that which was contracted between Laud and Buckingham. Through Buck-

ingham Laud was honoured by the notice of Prince Charles, and ceased to be an object of distrust to King James. These circumstances, together with his intimacy at a later period with Strafford, must induce us to modify the charge brought against him of a general repulsiveness of manner; although his manner, as he himself was among the first to admit, was, through his temper, offensive to those who opposed his will. He lamented the fact, but when he had given undue offence he was accustomed to take an early opportunity to conciliate by some kind action the person repulsed. Many there were who resented the unkind word and look, and who forgot the conciliatory action; but some would recognise the sterling worth of the man and smile at his eccentricities, for which they were willing, if not without regret, yet without taking further offence, to make allowance. His friends were few, his enemies a multitude.

Friendship between Laud and Buckingham.

Lewis XIV. was wont to say that although he had many secretaries, he had only one minister of state—himself. We have had occasion, more than once, to remark that this was the feeling of the Tudor and the Stewart dynasties. The king's will they regarded as law except when restrained by Magna Charta, by parliamentary enactments, or by royal concessions made from time to time to meet the exigencies of the age. What was required of the royal secretaries was to carry into effect the royal will. This principle was a reality in the great-minded Tudors. James and Charles were conscious, though they may not openly have admitted it, of a weakness of character or of will, which required the support of one whom they regarded as a friend and the public hated as a favourite. Buckingham did not shrink from acting as the friendly adviser to the Crown; but he, too, soon learned from experience that he had under-

CHAP. XXXIV. William Laud. 1633–45.

taken a task which unaided he was not able to perform. As his royal patrons, so he himself, looked out for a friend with whom to take counsel.

Buckingham directed his attention first of all to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Abbot, but he soon found that Abbot, being narrow-minded, and without grasp of mind to enter into the politics of the age, thought only of advancing a party in the Church, and the very party of which he and Prince Charles had the greatest fears. Abbot was willing to undertake the office, not actually mentioned but implied, and we have a letter of his replete with that fulsome flattery which Buckingham would have accepted from a courtier but disliked in a friend. Williams was thought of by the favourite, and his brilliant talents, extensive learning, and worldly wisdom would no doubt have fascinated Buckingham, if the friend he required was not one who would not boast of his influence over the favourite's mind, and if he had not discovered, what was palpable to all, that Williams was a self-seeker, who if he were disappointed, would give way to his angry passions, and do in his wrath what in his sober discretion he condemned.

Buckingham selects Laud for his counsellor.

Buckingham at last found in Laud the counsellor he required. Abrupt in manner and irritable in temper, he was not likely to interfere with the courtier; and yet Buckingham soon discovered that, rough as was Laud in his exterior, he had an affectionate disposition, of which we have abundant evidence in his intercourse with Buckingham, and in his correspondence afterwards with Strafford. He may have been mistaken, but he aimed at the public good; he never shrunk from declaring his opinions, and looked to the essential improvement of his friend. In this intimacy there is indeed something approaching to the grotesque. When we have gazed upon the noble portrait of Buckingham by Vandyke; when we

read of his splendid attire, and see the gay plumes which overshadowed his brow, his silk mantle and jewelled rapier; the frank and easy manner of the courtier, ever ready to draw his sword against a rival, or to dance with the fairest lady of the Court; himself regarded as the mirror of fashion and the "*elegantiæ arbiter*;" and when we compare the portrait of this gallant courtier with the physiognomy portrayed by the same artist, representing Laud stiff, and prim, and shy, in his square cap; not arrayed in any of the episcopal robes which he might have assumed if he had not affected simplicity in his gait and dress, we can hardly refrain from an expression of astonishment that a friendship should be found to have existed between men not only so discordant, but so apparently opposed. But they who are acquainted with the history of human nature are well aware that lasting friendships are often formed between dispositions of a distinct and different mould. The one seems to recognise in the other those points of character or peculiar virtues in which he is conscious of being defective himself. We often see the happiest families united, in persons very different in point of capacity and character, but making allowances the one for the other, until a union of friendship is formed not to be surpassed. But however we may account for the fact, the fact is itself indisputable, that without any view of personal interest on either side, a friendship existed between Laud and Buckingham which, while it gratified the kindly feelings of the former, involved him not unfrequently in difficulties from which he would fain have escaped.

Controversy with Fisher.

Circumstances at first of a private nature brought them into contact. While Puritanism was goading the middle and lower classes to attack the Church, the more serious courtiers were hurried on to the opposite extreme. It is always difficult to retain any but the really learned

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

in the Via Media. An attempt was made by the Jesuits, with some success, to win to the cause of Rome the mother of the favourite. The chief agent was one John Persy, whose historical name is Fisher. When it came to the king's knowledge that an impression had been made on the mind of the Countess of Buckingham, James indulged his controversial inclinations by undertaking to convince her of her errors; but the Jesuit, consulted in private, was more than a match for the king, and James, listening to the suggestion of Bishop Williams, appointed an argumentative conference to be held between the Jesuit Fisher and a competent divine of the Church of England. Dr. White, Rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, was selected as one who had studied deeply the controverted points between Canterbury and Rome. The subjects in dispute could not be settled in a single conference, and the king himself attended the second debate. A third conference became necessary, because the countess had been taught to regard the Church of Rome as the only visible and true Church. Whether Dr. White did not prove himself sufficiently ready to answer his opponent is not apparent; we only know that he nearly disappears from the third conference, the conduct of which was left solely to Laud, who had been privately consulted by the countess. Although Laud had little time for preparation, his deep, real, solid learning, his readiness, his sarcasm, and his wit, seemed like intuition.

These conferences were accounted private, and secrecy had been enjoined on all who were concerned in them; nevertheless Fisher had unjustifiably dispersed hundreds of papers on the subject of the third conference, before his answer to the nine points, proposed as the chief errors of the Romish Church, appeared.* These points were:

* Laud's Epistle dedicatory, p. iii.

1. The worship of images. 2. The prayings and offering oblation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. 3. Worshipping and invocation of saints and angels. 4. The Liturgy and private prayers in an unknown tongue. 5. Repetitions of Paternosters, Aves, and Creeds, especially affixing a kind of merit to the number of them. 6. The doctrine of transubstantiation. 7. Communion under one kind, and the abetting it by concomitancy. 8. Works of supererogation, especially with reference unto the treasure of the Church. 9. The opinion of deposing kings, giving away their kingdoms by papal power, whether directly or indirectly. Fisher wrote an answer to these questions, omitting only the last, which, he said, the rules of his order forbad him to touch; he might not interfere with State affairs.

Points for deliberation.

The Third Conference.

At Michaelmas, 1622, Bishop Laud was ready with his "Relation of the Third Conference," but its publication was delayed, as Dr. White had not prepared his "Replie to Jesuit Fisher's Answere to certain questions propounded by His Most Gracious Majesty King James." The joint production was published towards the latter end of 1624 under the initials R. B. (Richard Baily, chaplain to Laud), with the title, "An Answere to Mr. Fisher's Relation of a Third Conference between a certain B. (as he styles him) and himselfe. The Conference was very private, till Mr. Fisher spread certaine papers of it, which in many respects required an answere. This was given by R. B., chaplain to the B., that was employed in the Conference. London. Printed by Adam Islip. 1624." It was really Bishop Laud's own work, and it afterwards appeared under his name alone, with the title, "A Relation of the Conference betweene William Lawd, then L^rd^ Bishop of St. David's, now Lord Arch-bishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Fisher the Jesuite, by the command of King James,

CHAP. XXXIV.
William Laud.
1633–45.

of ever blessed memorie, with an Answer to such exceptions as A. C. takes against it. 1639."

Fisher's history.

A. C. is Fisher himself, whose real name, as we have before observed, was Piersey, Piers, Percy, or Persy; he was a north-countryman, who had been converted at an early age by a Roman Catholic woman with whom he had lodged. Educated at Rheims, he was afterwards placed in the English college at Rome. On his way to England in 1596, as a Jesuit emissary, he was seized by some English soldiers at Flushing, taken prisoner to England, and thrown into Bridewell. Released, he made himself conspicuous for his zeal, and was frequently afterwards imprisoned. When summoned to the three conferences, he was a "prisoner for the Catholique faith," and it was made a subject of accusation against Laud, on his trial, that he had been anxious to obtain Fisher's release, and had done his best, once or twice, to prevent his arrest.*

Laud's leniency towards him.

Laud, when archbishop, was certainly instrumental in obtaining a commutation of Fisher's punishment. It was, at that time, felony for one of the Jesuits to be found in England, and Fisher was arrested and examined before the Council on the charge. Archbishop Laud and Secretary Cooke were deputed to go to the king to learn his pleasure, and returning to the Board, the archbishop thus addressed the Jesuit: "Master Fisher, kneel down upon your knees, every morning and every evening, and pray for the king for granting you your life; and, to be short, Master Fisher, his majesty's pleasure is, that you shall be forthwith banished this kingdom, and all other his majesty's dominions, and you shall remain prisoner in the Gatehouse until you put in good security before the king's attorney, Sir John Banks, never to return again." But Fisher answered that "if he had a hundred lives he

* Canterburie's Doome, pp. 451–453.

would come hither again, or elsewhere, if his superior so commanded," and he utterly refused to give any security.* He was committed, but afterwards released, in consequence of the general policy of discharging all Roman Catholic prisoners, when in a catalogue of the priests set free, to the number of seventy-seven, the name of John Piers, alias Fisher, appears. He remained in London, and died of cancer there, but in what year is uncertain.†

The disposition of Laud towards leniency in respect of his antagonists is here sufficiently shown. The same will be observed with regard to his relations with the Lord Keeper Williams, who, though bitter against him, was on the whole spoken of kindly by Laud. The estrangement between the two which happened on account of Laud's friendship with Buckingham, was ever a matter of deep regret to him.

That Laud's powers of argument made an impression on the mind of the Countess of Buckingham is certain; but it was transitory. She relapsed into her error, and was expelled the Court.

With her son the effect was different. He honoured his mother, and loved his wife; both were Papists, and under these influences, his own allegiance to the Church of England was supposed to have been shaken. He attended, however, the conference, and was much and lastingly convinced by the outspoken logic of Laud. The work, indeed, when published was regarded as a masterpiece. Even Laud's bitter enemy, Sir Edward Dering, admitted that he had "muzzled the Jesuit and struck the Papist under the fifth rib;"‡ and he would be a bold man who

* Canterburie's Doome, p. 452.

† Dodd's History of the Church, iii. p. 394.

‡ Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. p. 119. Laud did not obtain popularity by his controversial success. The Puritans continued their hatred against him, and the hatred of the Papists was redoubled. Between the upper and nether millstones he was to be crushed.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

at the present time should engage in doctrinal controversy with Rome without first perusing a work which has long occupied the first place in the theological literature of England. It may be inferred that Laud's first interviews with Buckingham related to his faith and confirmed him in his religious profession.

He confirms Buckingham in his loyalty to the Church.

Laud says in his diary bearing date 1622, June 9: "Being Whitsun Day my Lord Marquis of Buckingham was pleased to enter into a near respect to me; the particulars are not for paper. June 15. I became C. to my Lord of Buckingham." The initial C. in this entry is understood by Heylyn to mean confessor. By some persons it was supposed to mean chaplain. Laud himself, in his "Troubles and Trial," observes, "It is said that I became C., that is confessor to the lord duke. If my lord duke should honour me so far as to make me his confessor, as I know no sin in it, so it is abundantly proof that the passages before mentioned were not fit for paper." He denied that he was confessor in the Romish acceptation of the word; but that he was his spiritual adviser is certain. When we read that on the 16th June, the lord marquis received the Sacrament at Greenwich, we may fairly infer what their previous consultation had been. It is probable that Buckingham stated the difficulties suggested to his mind by his mother, and it was with a kind of triumphant feeling that Laud recorded his success by narrating the fact of his being appointed his chaplain on the 15th of June, and of his taking the Holy Sacrament the day following. Buckingham remained from this time a determined son of the Church of England; and between him and Laud an intimacy existed which terminated only in the duke's death. The intimacy offended many of the courtiers and was most ungraciously resented by Archbishop Abbot. He represented Laud as the only "inward" counsellor with Buckingham, "sitting

with him sometimes privately whole hours and feeding his humour with spite and malice."

It is not probable, though he at one period thought of doing so, that Laud would retire from the Court, so long as either with Buckingham or the king he retained any influence. But his object was rather to enforce the law than to defend a principle, of which he himself had no doubt, and which might be defended by others. He saw the weakness of those with whom he was associated, including King James and his favourite, and he evidently felt that it was his vocation to inspire that firmness, which sometimes in himself amounted to moroseness. It was this feeling on the part of Laud that accounts for the leniency which he sometimes exhibited towards those who, having violated the law, became by degrees obedient to it. He was stern to the offenders, seeking to compel them to do what he believed it his duty to enforce; but when the end was obtained, Laud would admit even to his friendship those who at one time were most opposed to him. We might mention many to whom, besides such men as the memorable Hales and Bishop Hall, these observations are applicable. With regard to the publication of the Conferences, he writes: "I had not hitherto appeared in print. I am no controvertist. May God so love and bless my soul, as I desire and endeavour, that all the never-to-be-enough deplored distractions of the Church may be composed happily, and to the glory of His Name."*

Of such a work as Laud's Conferences with Fisher, it is impossible to give an abstract—to be properly appreciated, it must be carefully read; but the following extract is important in the biography of Laud, from its being descriptive of the manner in which he upheld that "via media" of which sound Churchmen, to the present hour, make their boast:—

* Diary, Feb. 4, 1623.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

"Let me be bold to observe to your majesty in particular, concerning your great charge in the Church of England. She is in hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her for novelty in her doctrine. She practises Church government as it hath been in use in all ages, and all places, where the Church of Christ hath been established both in and since the days of the Apostles, and yet the separatist condemns her for antichristianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones, and unless your majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable, that while both these press hard upon the Church of England, both of them cry out against persecution, like froward children, who scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while, as if they were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this: The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old, and when errors are grown, by age, and continuance, to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be of an older, are usually challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, whether we will or not, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, Where was your Church before Luther? for it was just there, where theirs is now: one and the same Church still, no doubt of that: one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us: the same

man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separation, or change of discipline; though all he says, or can say, be, in truth of divinity, and among learned men, little better than ridiculous; yet since those fond opinions have gained some ground among the people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing. But for so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, they are bells of passing good metal, and tunable enough of themselves, and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is, that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are by them who have acquired power in and over their consciences. And for this there is remedy enough, but how long there will be I know not.

"The Scripture, where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture: yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that, upon just and farther evidence, she may not revive that which in any case hath slept by her. What success the great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither party consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme, which they both seem to oppose and to fear. The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle; out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it: but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too. Salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this discourse, I have, therefore, endea-

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

voured to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church, confined to no age, time, or place, not knowing any bounds, but that faith which was once, and but once for all, delivered to the saints. And in my pursuit of this way, I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof I have obeyed your majesty, discharged my duty, to my power, to the Church of England, given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God's blessing and favour purpose to die."

Proposed misappropriation of the funds of the Charter House.

Of the independent nature of the friendship between Buckingham and Laud we have an instance in what related to the Charter House. The king, as usual, was in want of money, and the parliament refused to grant any further supplies. There had been, indeed, unnecessary expenditure, at least it was thought so, in the case of the King of Bohemia; and in other matters the king had not been regardful of the public purse. The exchequer was at its lowest ebb, and it was necessary that funds should be raised from one source or another. The rich revenues of the Charter House offered a tempting bait. With an unscrupulous minister there would have been no difficulty; but Laud, though ever anxious to please the king, and with a very high feeling in regard to the regale, maintained the cause of justice against the avarice of the Crown and the favourite. The design of appropriating the revenues of the Charter House to the support of the Crown was opened to Laud by the Duke of Buckingham on the 25th of September. The bishop thus mentions it briefly: "Saturday. My L. D.'s proposal about an army, and the means—and whether Sutton's hospital might not, &c."* In vain did the minister argue the point; in vain did he bring forward plausible reasons for the measure;

* Diary, Sept. 25, 1624.

in vain did he speak of easing the subject by this application of the funds of such easy utilisation; and of thus meeting the urgent necessities of the king. Laud stood firm; he resolutely opposed a scheme which would have paralysed the hand of charity, and have rendered impossible public endowments from private resources. Laud must have felt that by so doing he might expose himself to the loss of Buckingham's favour and to the displeasure of the king, but he was not shaken, and by his faithful and intrepid bearing, he preserved a national institution, the confiscation of which would have afforded a mere temporary relief to the Crown, but which has now remained an everlasting possession. In this work we find Abbot co-operating with Laud; but their circumstances were different. Abbot had already quarrelled with Buckingham and the Court, and cared not therefore whether he added or not to the offence he had given. With Laud it would have been a question whether he should in his turn share the disgrace of Abbot, if he had had regard to private considerations, instead of fixing his eye, as was his wont, to the one public object and patriotic design.

If credit be due to Laud, who firmly adhered to the cause of justice and honesty, let not praise be withheld from his noble friend, who suffered himself to be persuaded against his wishes and his interests. Historians generally love to dwell on the faults of such a man as Buckingham. I must confess that I prefer to make discovery of the virtues which have distinguished a man of eminence. While admitting and condemning his faults, we must not forget that they may be qualified by virtues which those who envied him were slow to detect, and quick to forget. Clarendon speaks of the nobleness of disposition which that observer of character traced in one whom he severely censured.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Laud's firmness, on this occasion, instead of causing offence, only confirmed him in the favour of Buckingham, and Buckingham's acquiescence in Laud's advice, endeared him to the heart of one whose manner, however uncouth, cannot have been quite as offensive as his enemies have described it. The deep affection of Laud for Buckingham is to be seen in his prayers, intended for no eye but his own until his enemies made them public.*

"Gracious Father, I humbly beseech Thee, bless the Duke of Buckingham with all spiritual and temporal blessings, but especially spiritual. Make and continue him faithful to his prince, serviceable to his country, devout in Thy truth and Church; a most happy husband, and a blessed father; filled with the constant love and honour of his prince, that all Thy blessings may flow upon himself, and his posterity after him. Continue him a true-hearted friend to me, Thy poor servant, whom Thou hast honoured in his eyes. Make my heart religious and dutiful to Thee, and in and under Thee true, and secret, and stout, and provident in all things which he shall be pleased to commit unto me. Even so, Lord, and make him continually to serve Thee, that Thou mayest bless him, through Christ, our only Lord and Saviour. Amen."

Laud's desire, from his first appointment to the bishopric of St. David's, had been to hold a visitation in his remote diocese. This he was prevented from doing for some time, his presence being required at Court.

* Fault has been found with the publication of Laud's Private Diary and his Book of Private Prayers. But the publication was rendered necessary by the circulation of Prynne's Breviat. Falsehoods were introduced into the Breviat, and asserted as portions of Laud's Diary, which contained them not. Gross and wicked conclusions were drawn from Laud's simple statement of facts.

There his abilities had at length been recognised by King James. And now having established his character as a divine in his controversy with Fisher, his advice was required on matters of state. He had been in consequence enthroned in his cathedral by proxy, and his primary visitation was for a season deferred.

Sermon at Whitehall.

On the 24th of March, the day of the king's accession, Laud was appointed to preach before the Court at Whitehall. Choosing for his text the sixth and seventh verses of the twenty-first Psalm, he dwelt upon the "divine right of kings." The sermon was an able one, though it was not in accordance with modern notions, and by the royal command it was published. It is the second of the seven sermons by Laud which were printed, and is thus preserved to us. Laud spoke at the outset of the king's recovered health; "thanks were due for that."

But the king's illness seems to have been a political illness. The parliament being in a state of great excitement about the Spanish match, the king, in spite of a bleak and cold season, journeyed to Newmarket. His health was the pretext; but removal from the noise and disturbance which perpetually proclaimed the discontent of the Commons was the real cause of his journey.*

Laud, when he took his place in the House of Lords as Bishop of St. David's, was evidently looked upon with suspicion, and he had a difficult task to perform. He had to defend what, if defensible, was obnoxious to his patriotic feelings, the intended marriage between the Prince of Wales and the Infanta of Spain. This was an alliance to which James was inclined from motives purely political. The king demanded fresh supplies from the Commons, but received instead successive addresses, in which the members, either really Puritans, or for politi-

* Wilson's Life and Reign of King James, 1653, p. 171.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1632–45.

cal purposes assuming to be such, met his applications by expressing their alarm at the growth of popery, and at the danger of an alliance with a Roman Catholic princess. They urged the king, at all risks, even at the chance of involving the nation in war, to refuse his sanction to the alliance with Spain. The king was indeed perplexed. His abhorrence of war had prevented the country from retaining that high position in which it had been left by Queen Elizabeth. His son-in-law, the Elector, had permitted his ambition to involve him in a ruin from which he could only be rescued by pecuniary assistance from England. The Commons of England had already granted two subsidies, and further assistance the king, with an empty exchequer, was unable to give. The whole country, including Scotland as well as Ireland, was in a state almost amounting to rebellion, and now the Commons made a protestation, which was entered on record in their journal books, to the effect "that the liberties, franchises, privileges, and jurisdictions of parliaments are the ancient and undoubted birthright and inheritance of the subjects of England; and the maintenance and making of laws, and redress of mischiefs and grievances which daily happen within this realm, are proper subjects and matter of debate in parliament; that every member of the Houses of Parliament ought to have of right freedom of speech to treat on such matters; that every member should have freedom from molestation or punishment for the expression of his opinions; and that if any complaint was made of members, the same should be shewed to the king by the advice and assent of all the Commons assembled in parliament, before the king give credence to any private information."

Discontent of the country.

There was no reference to the religious difficulty in this protestation. The king, thinking that an encroachment was intended on his prerogative, was much exasperated,

and gave vent to his indignation in words. He treated the committee of the House, when it waited upon him, with characteristic ridicule. "Bring stools for the ambassadors," he cried, with uncouth jocosity, implying that they were in his regard men no better than foreigners. He called for the Journals of the House, and with his own hand tore out the pages which contained the protestation. He declared that he would govern according to the common weal, not according to the common will, and determined to do without the help of parliament. On the 19th of December, the very day on which the protestation was voted at Westminster, he gave orders for a prorogation, under the pretext that it was necessary for the members to go into the country to keep hospitality, and according to the ancient custom of the English people, in the Christmas holidays, to entertain their neighbours. They had hardly dispersed before the king issued his proclamation, discharging the members of both Houses from any further attendance, and thus the parliament was dissolved.

Laud proceeds to his diocese.

As soon as parliament was dissolved, Laud proceeded to his diocese, and made a pastoral inspection of its affairs. In olden times the bishops of St. David's had been metropolitans, the archiepiscopal see of Caerleon having been removed thither in the year 519. They had maintained their power, and at their hands the other Welsh bishops had received their consecration, until the reign of Henry I., when Bishop Barnard was forced to make submission to the church of Canterbury. At the time of Bishop Laud's appointment, the city of St. David's was but a village, consisting almost exclusively of the church, the ruins of the bishop's palace, and one or two houses belonging to the canons; * but the diocese was large, comprising five

* Cyp. Ang., p. 87.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

whole counties, and portions of four others.* The bishop therefore only paid a short visit to his cathedral city, and then devoted his time to the other and more important parishes under his episcopal jurisdiction. Throughout his visitation he acted on his usual principle. He pointed out what the law of the land required, in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil, and demanded whether the law was observed. Several of the churches were found to be in a bad condition; and while he required their reparation, and insisted upon their being rendered fit for the proper celebration of divine service, at the same time he himself assisted with no ungenerous hand, and appropriated his own revenues to effect this praiseworthy purpose. The episcopal residence had been removed from St. David's to a village near Caermarthen; and at Aberguilly Laud found no chapel, or none such as a bishop ought to have in his house, especially when at a distance from his cathedral. He set an example by causing at once the erection of a chapel, fitting and commodious, and upon this chapel he spared no expense or care.

Restores the chapel at Aberguilly.

Laud's dreams.

The faith that Laud always had in dreams and omens is remarkable. He mentions his dreams as if they were matters of importance, and seems sometimes to regard them as almost prophetical. They are mentioned in his diary, and often with some exclamation, as "God grant better things!" † Faith in dreams prevailed at the time, and this was not therefore singular in Laud; and, recorded in a diary intended for no eye but his own, they

* In the diocese were the counties of Pembroke, Cardigan, Caermarthen, Radnor, and Brecknock; and portions of Monmouth, Hereford, Montgomery, and Glamorgan. With all the vast area which these contained, there were no more than 308 parishes, and of these 120 were accounted as impropriations.

† Diary, Sept. 4, 1625.

evince an affectionate, if a superstitious disposition. His relatives, his friends, his servants are in his thoughts, and he sees them in his dreams. King James appears to him with a smiling countenance, and beckons to him.* His father approaches him, to his thinking as well, kind, and cheerful as he was wont to see him, and tells him he would remain with him till he had him away with him. And Laud adds, "I am not moved with dreams, but I thought fit to remember this."† He lays particular stress on the fact, that the day after the consecration of his chapel, occurred the day in the calendar on which was commemorated the beheading of St. John Baptist. But here we have to repeat that his diary was not intended for public inspection and criticism. He wrote it for himself, to recall to his own mind certain matters which he deemed important to himself, or which he might regard as indicating a providential interposition. The age was in this respect superstitious. Charles I. resorted to the *sortes Virgilianæ*, and was sore troubled when, at his trial, the head of his cane fell off. Oliver Cromwell had his lucky days. All the world believed in witchcraft. But however visionary Laud may appear when writing his diary, no one can deny that he was a practical man; if not worldly-wise at all times, yet never at a loss in the choice of means to further his ends. When he had work to do, he did it with his might, holding that course which he felt to be the right one firmly, though not always with due consideration and kindness. He set things in order, but with an austerity of manner which prevented many who respected him from giving him their affection.

A great deal was accomplished in his primary visitation. He entered into the details of his work thoroughly, and spared neither pains nor expense to reduce to order the

* Diary, July 3, 1625. † Diary, Friday, Jan. 24, 1639.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

things that had been wanting in the Church. He was enabled to act with munificence by the preferments which at length had been conferred upon him. He had been presented to the rectory of Rudbackston, in the diocese of St. David's;* a dispensation had been granted him to hold *in commendam* the prebend of Llambister in the Collegiate Church of Brecknock,† and he had been presented to the parsonage of Creeke, in Northamptonshire.‡

Small, therefore, as were the estates of his See, Laud was not without means to encourage and help the poor parsons in his diocese, and his assistance was given generously and without grudging. His object was always to promote a sound adherence to the laws of the State and the canons of the Church. He urged on his clergy a due and reverent observance of the Church's ordinances. Many of the clergy in his diocese of St. David's, thinking that their sole duty was to preach, were careless in regard to other Church matters, especially in what related to the ministration of the Sacraments. Laud insisted on the regular and zealous performance of neglected duties. His own feelings with respect to the Church will be seen from the following prayers from his private devotions:

His object.

His prayers.

"O Lord, we humbly beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion, that they which do lean only upon hope of Thy heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by Thy mighty power; and that I may humbly and faithfully serve Thee in this Thy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Gracious Father, I humbly beseech Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, fill it with all truth, in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purge it; where it

* Le Neve, p. 122. Sanderson's Continuation of Rymer, p. 358.

† Sanderson, pp. 364–366.

‡ Ib., p. 446. Wood, Ath. Ox., iii. p. 123.

is in error, direct it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where anything is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is in want, furnish it; where it is divided and rent asunder, make up the breaches of it; O Thou Holy One of Israel. Amen.

"O merciful God, since Thou hast ordered me to live in these times, in which the rents of Thy Church are grievous, I humbly beseech Thee to guide me, that the divisions of men may not separate me either from Thee or it, that I may ever labour the preservation of truth and peace, that where for and by our sins the peace of it succeeds not, Thou wilt yet accept my will for the deed, that I may still pray, even while Thou grantest not, because I know Thou wilt grant when Thou seest it fit. In the mean time bless, I beseech Thee, this Church in which I live, that in it I may honour and serve Thee all the days of my life, and after this be glorified by thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"O Lord, Thou hast brought a Vine out of Egypt, and planted it; Thou madest room for it, and when it had taken root it filled the land. O why hast Thou broken down her hedge, that all which go by pluck off her grapes. The wild boar out of the wood rooteth it up, and the wild beasts of the field devour it. O turn Thee again, Thou God of hosts, look down from heaven, behold, and visit this Vine, and the place of the vineyard that Thy right hand hath planted, and the branch that Thou madest so strong for Thyself. Lord, hear me, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord, except thou buildest the house, their labour is but lost that build it: and except Thou, O Lord, keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain. It is but lost labour to rise early, and take late rest, and to eat the bread of carefulness, if Thou bless not the endeavours that seek the peace and the welfare of Thy Church.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Therefore, O Lord, build thy Church, and keep it, and take care for it, that there may not be lost labour among the builders of it. Amen.

"O Lord our God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible God; O Thou which keepest covenant and mercy, let not all the troubles seem little before Thee that hath come upon us, upon our priests, upon the houses built and dedicated to Thy Name, upon the maintenance for them that serve at Thy altar, upon our kings, state, and people, since that day of affliction. Thou art just in all that is brought upon us: for Thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly. Yet, O Lord, have mercy, and turn to us again, for Jesus Christ and His mercy sake. Amen."

We may here add from the same work, his prayers headed "Consecrationes, Ordinationes," which show the feeling with which he entered upon his episcopal duties:

"O Lord, I am now at Thy altar, at Thy work; keep me that I lay not my hands suddenly upon any man, lest I be partaker of other men's sins; but that I may keep myself pure in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Lord, give me grace, that as oft as they shall come in my way, I may put them in remembrance whom I have ordained, that they stir up the gift of God that is in them by the putting on of my hands, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

His private feelings as regards the Eucharist may be gathered from the devotions he used in private.

"Quæcunque ab Infantia usque ad momentum hoc, sciens vel ignorans, intus vel extra, dormiens vel vigilans, verbis, factis vel cogitationibus, per jacula inimici ignita, per desideria cordis immunda peccavi Tibi, miserere mei, et dimitte mihi, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

"Almighty God and most merciful Father, give me, I beseech Thee, that grace, that I may duly examine the

inmost of my heart, and my most secret thoughts, how I stand before Thee. Lord, I confess all my sins, and my unworthiness to present myself at Thine altar. But Thou canst forgive sin, and give repentance; do both, gracious Father, and then behold I am clean to come unto Thee. Lord, make me a worthy receiver of that for which I come,—Christ, and remission of sin in Christ: and that for His own mercy sake and Thine. Amen.

"O Lord, into a clean, charitable, and thankful heart, give me grace to receive the blessed Body and Blood of Thy Son, my most blessed Saviour, that it may more perfectly cleanse me from all dregs of sin; that being made clean, it may nourish me in faith, hope, charity, and obedience, with all other fruits of spiritual life and growth in Thee; that in all the future course of my life, I may shew myself such an ingrafted member into the Body of Thy Son, that I may never be drawn to do anything that may dishonour His Name. Grant this, O Lord, I beseech Thee, even for His merit and mercy sake. Amen.

"O Lord God, hear my prayers. I come to Thee in a stedfast faith; yet for the clearness of my faith, Lord, enlighten it; for the strength of my faith, Lord, increase it. And, behold, I quarrel not the words of Thy Son my Saviour's blessed Institution. I know His words are no gross unnatural conceit, but they are spirit and life, and supernatural. While the world disputes, I believe. He hath promised me, if I come worthily, that I shall receive His most precious Body and Blood, with all the benefits of His passion. If I can receive it and retain it, (Lord, make me able, make me worthy), I know I can no more die eternally, than that Body and Blood can die, and be shed again. My Saviour is willing in this tender of them both unto me: Lord, so wash and cleanse my soul, that I may now, and at all times else, come prepared by hearty prayers and devotion, and be made worthy by

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

Thy grace of this infinite blessing, the pledge and earnest of eternal life, in the merits of the same Jesus Christ, Who gave His Body and Blood for me. Amen.

"Almighty God, unto Whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from Whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of my heart by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that I may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Pater de cœlis Deus, qui unigenitum tuum pro nobis ad mortem tradidisti.

"Fili Redemptor mundi Deus, qui sanguine tuo pretioso nos a peccatis abluisti.

"Spiritus Sancte Paraclete Deus, qui corda sanctorum tua gratia visitas et confirmas.

"Sacra, summa, sempiterna, beata, benedicta Trinitas; Pater bone, Fili pie, Spiritus benigne: cujus opus vita, amor gratia, contemplatio gloria: cujus majestas ineffabilis, potestas incomparabilis, bonitas inæstimabilis: qui vivorum Dominus es simul et mortuorum: te adoro, te invoco, et toto cordis affectu nunc et in seculum benedico. Amen.

"O Domine Jesu, da vivis misericordiam et gratiam: da tuis regimen et lucem perpetuam: da ecclesiæ tuæ veritatem et pacem; da mihi miserrimo peccatorum pœnitentiam et veniam. Amen.

"O Domine, errantes oro corrige, incredulos converte, ecclesiæ fidem auge, hæreses destrue, hostes versutos detege, violentos et impœnitentes contere, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

"Misericors Pater, pro beneficiis quæ mihi largiti sunt in terris benefactores mei, præmia æterna consequantur in cœlis. Oro etiam ut cum his pro quibus oravi, aut pro quibus orare teneor, et cum omni populo Dei, introduci mihi detur in regnum tuum, et ibi apparere in

justitia, et satiari gloria, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

"O Lord, consider my complaint, for I am brought very low. O Lord, how long wilt Thou be angry with Thy servant that prayeth? O Lord, give me grace and repentance, and Thou canst not be angry with my prayer. O Lord, I am Thine, save me, and deliver me not into the will of mine enemies, especially my ghostly enemies. O Lord, I am Thy servant, Thy unprofitable wasteful servant, yet Thy servant. O Lord, set my accounts right before Thee, and pardon all my misspendings and misreckonings. O Lord, I am Thy son, Thy most unkind, prodigal, runaway son, yet Thy son. O Lord, though I have not retained the love and duty of a son, yet do not Thou cast off (I humbly beg it) the kindness and compassion of a Father. O Lord, in thy grace, I return to Thee; and though I have eaten draff with all the unclean swine in the world, in my hungry absence from Thee, yet now, Lord, upon my humble return to Thee, give me, I beseech Thee, the bread of life, the Body and Blood of my Saviour, into my soul, that I may be satisfied in Thee, and never more run away from Thee, even for Jesus Christ His sake, that gave himself for me. Amen.

"Misericors Deus, Creator omnium hominum, qui nihil odisti eorum quæ condidisti, nec vis mortem peccatoris, sed magis ut convertatur et vivat; miserere omnium Judæorum, Turcarum, Infidelium, et Hæreticorum. Aufer ab iis ignorantiam, duritiem cordis, et contemptum verbi tui: et reduc eos, misericors Domine, ad gregem tuum ut serventur inter reliquias veri Israelis, ut fiat unum ovile, et unus pastor, Jesus Christus Dominus noster, qui vivat et regnat, &c. Amen.

"Tanquam pro tribunali tuo tremendo (ubi nullus erit personarum respectus) reum memet peragens, ita hodie antequam præveniat me dies judicii mei coram sancto tuo

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

altari prostratus, coram te et stupendis angelis tuis a propria conscientia dejectus, profero improbas et nefarias cogitationes et actiones meas. Respice, oro Domine, humilitatem meam, et remitte omnia peccata mea, quæ multiplicata sunt super capillos capitis mei. Quodnam enim est malum quod non designavi in anima mea: quin et multa et nefanda opere perpetravi. Reus enim sum, ô Domine, invidiæ, gulæ, &c. Omnes sensus meos, omnia membra mea pollui. Sed incomparabilis est multitudo viscerum tuorum, et ineffabilis misericordia bonitatis tuæ, qua peccata mea toleras. Quare, ô Rex omni admiratione major, O Domine longanimis misericordias tuas mirificato in me peccatore: potentiam benignitatis tuæ manifestato, clementissimæ propensionis tuæ virtutem exerito: et me prodigum reverentem suscipito, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

"O Lord God, how I receive the Body and Blood of my most blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, the price of my redemption, is the very wonder of my soul, yet my most firm and constant belief upon the words of my Saviour. At this time they are graciously tendered to me and my faith; Lord, make me a worthy receiver, and be unto me as He hath said. Amen.

"Lord, I have received this Sacrament of the Body and Blood of my dear Saviour. His mercy hath given it, and my faith received it into my soul. I humbly beseech Thee speak mercy and peace unto my conscience, and enrich me with all those graces which come from that precious Body and Blood, even till I be possessed of eternal life in Christ. Amen.

"O qui sursum patri assides et hic nobiscum invisibiliter versaris, venito et sanctificato præsentia hæc dona; eos item pro quibus, et eos per quos, et ea propter quæ offeruntur. Amen."

The bishop having completed his visitation of his dio-

cese, returned to London, and waited upon the King. A report soon reached the court, that the Puritan faction at Oxford had again gone beyond their limits, and that a violent sermon had been preached at St. Mary's, in which the doctrines of Calvin had been asserted and enforced in extreme language. The report was worse than the fact. One Knight, a fellow of Broadgate, afterwards known by the name of Pembroke College, had broached the question, "whether subjects 'se defendendo' in case of religion, might take up arms against their sovereign?" and had answered in the affirmative, saying, that the inferior magistrate had a lawful power to order and correct the king, if he did amiss, by turning tyrant, by forcing blasphemy or idolatry on his subjects, or by laying intolerable burdens upon them. He maintained that when resistance is the only expedient to save themselves and to gain their object, resistance was lawful to subjects. For these tenets Knight was summoned before the vice-chancellor, Dr. Piers. He was required to give up his notes, and was called upon to confess who were the abettors and contrivers of his sermon. He named two others, who had seen his sermon before he preached it; and the three were committed to prison. Laud was with the king, and at the royal command the seditious preacher was cited to Court, to which the sermon had been transmitted. Knight confessed, that he had taken his sermon from a foreign Calvinist, Paræus, and that he had advanced those opinions, without taking thought of the consequences. He declared, that he preached the sermon without any political motive, and that he was heartily sorry for what he had done.

Knight's sermon at Oxford.

Knight was condemned, and sent to the Gatehouse at Westminster, where he remained in confinement for two years; * and the king wrote to the vice-chancellor,

* Wood's Annals, vol. ii. pt. 1.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

desiring that in future more heed might be taken to ensure that students in divinity should apply themselves "in the first place to the reading of Scripture, next the Councils and ancient Fathers, and then the schoolmen," excluding those "neotericks," both Jesuits and Puritans, who were well known to be meddlers in matters of State and monarchy.

The work of Paræus from which Knight had obtained his arguments was publicly burnt at Oxford, Cambridge, and St. Paul's Cross, London.* Its dogmas were declared seditious and treasonable, and an oath was framed, which every preacher was called upon to subscribe, to the effect that he not only renounced the principles of the book, but that he would oppose them to the utmost of his ability to the end of his life. The account of this violence makes our blood boil with indignation when we read it in the nineteenth century; but as we make allowance for the persecutions of which Cranmer, and even James himself were guilty, so we must remember that, conceding what were, even at this period, the still admitted rights of royalty, it is difficult to understand how such language was to be "allowed when addressed to undergraduates and the ignorant." It was only by strong measures that the violent were to be restrained.

Diversity of doctrine at Oxford.

In the University many of the younger students, disgusted by the extremes to which they were exposed through the Puritan faction, had turned Papists. The heresy of the Anabaptists prevailed in some quarters. The Brownists or Independents joined with the others to form a united faction, and were as much opposed to the laws of the State as to the ecclesiastical canons.

Different and discordant doctrines being preached openly in the churches, and both Papists and Puritans alike indulging in "rude and undecent railings," the king

* Cyp. Ang., p. 91.

thought fit to issue a letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, bearing date August 20, 1622, to be by them communicated to their suffragans. This letter would seem to have been written, if not by the hand, yet by the advice of Laud. The injunctions ordered: that no preacher under the degree and calling of a bishop, or dean of a cathedral or collegiate church (and they only on festivals of the Church, or certain specified occasions), should take the expounding of any text of Scripture whatsoever, to fall into any set course or common place, which was not comprehended and warranted in essence, substance, effect, or natural inference, within some one of the Articles of Religion set forth 1562, or in some one of the Homilies set forth by authority in the Church of England; and that for their further instruction for the performance thereof, they should forthwith read over and peruse diligently the said Book of Articles, and the two Books of Homilies; that no parson, vicar, curate, or lecturer should preach any sermon or collation hereafter, upon Sundays and holydays in the afternoons, in any cathedral or parish church, but upon some part of the Catechism, or some text taken out of the Creed, or Commandments, or the Lord's Prayer (funeral sermons only excepted); and that those preachers should be most encouraged and approved of who spend their afternoon's exercise in the examination of children in their Catechisms, which is the most ancient and laudable custom of teaching in the Church of England: that no preacher of what title soever, under the degree of bishop, or a dean at the least, should presume to preach in popular auditory, the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresponsibility of God's grace: that no preacher should presume from henceforth to declare, limit, or bound out, by way of positive doctrine, in any lecture or sermon, the power, prerogative,

The King's injunctions.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

jurisdiction, or duty of sovereign princes; or should causelessly, and without any invitation from the text, fall into any bitter invectives and indecent railing speeches against the Papists or Puritans:

"And that the archbishops and bishops (whom his majesty blamed for their former remissness) should be more wary and choice in the licensing of preachers; and that all lecturers throughout the kingdom" (a new body, severed from the ancient clergy of England, as being neither parson, vicar, nor curate), "should be licensed henceforward in the Court of Faculties, only on recommendation of the party, from the bishop of the diocese, under his hand and seal, with a fiat from the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and a confirmation under the Great Seal of England."

Ferment among the Puritans.

The ferment that these instructions caused amongst the Puritans was very great. They would appear to have been aimed against both extremes—Popery and Puritanism—but the Puritans could only see in them reference to themselves; and "strange 'twas to hear the several descants and discourses which were made upon them, how much they were misreported amongst the people and misinterpreted by themselves." *

It was reported by the Puritans, that hostility to preaching was manifested, except within certain very narrow limits. The king became alarmed, and desired the Archbishop of Canterbury to confer with the Archbishop of York and to enter into explanations which would exonerate his majesty from responsibility in the matter. These the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were to disseminate through their suffragans and the inferior clergy. But the disquiet was universal, and the Puritans, hating Laud more than ever as the supposed author of

* Cyp. Ang., p. 94.

the injunctions, and looking out for reprisals, made capital of the proposed alliance with Spain.

When Buckingham attended the prince to Spain he left Laud to watch over his interests at the Court of James, who remained weak in will and as vacillating as ever. The journey to Spain was a secret journey under the connivance of the king. Laud was accused of being cognizant of the proceeding; and it was asserted that he encouraged the alliance as a means of promoting the interests of the papacy. This came from the pen of Prynne;* but the following prayer which Laud composed on the occasion is a sufficient answer to such cavils.

Laud accused of being cognizant of the Spanish journey.

"O most merciful God and gracious Father, the prince hath put himself to a great adventure, I humbly beseech Thee make a clear way before him: give Thine angels charge over him, be with him Thyself in mercy, power, and protection; in every step of his journey; in every moment of his time; and every consultation and address for action; till Thou bring him back with safety, honour, and contentment, to do Thee service in this place.

"Bless his most trusty and faithful servant, the Lord Duke of Buckingham, that he may be diligent in service, provident in business, wise and happy in counsels; for the honour of Thy Name, the good of Thy Church, the preservation of the prince, the contentment of the king, the satisfaction of the State. Preserve him, I humbly beseech Thee, from all envy that attends him; and bless him that his eye may see the prince safely delivered to the king and State, and after it to live long in happiness, to do Thee and them service; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The directions to the prince's chaplains also shew

* Breviat, p. 14. Canterburie's Doome, p. 276. Hidden Works of Darkness, pp. 34–5.

CHAP. XXXIV. William Laud. 1633–45.

that there was no intention of his royal highness joining in, or becoming acquainted with the ceremonial of the Romish Church. A room was to be set apart for prayer and used for no other purpose; and this room was to be arranged chapel-wise, and to contain all the appurtenances and ornaments necessary for a decent and devout celebration of divine service. The Communion was to be celebrated occasionally. Prayers were to be offered twice a day—matins and evensong. All reverence was to be used by everyone present; standing up at the Creeds and Gospel, and bowing at the name of Jesus. No polemical preachings were to be allowed, no occasions of conference or dispute to be given. The doctrines of the Church of England were to be upheld, and many copies of the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Book of Common Prayer in various languages, were to be carried with them by the chaplains. The king also added his own works in English and Latin, as equally important!

That the King of Spain, and his minister, the Conde de Olivares, expected that the Prince of Wales would embrace the Roman faith, is evident from the following extract from an historical fragment, lately brought to light. The Conde de Olivares having been suddenly told that the English prince had arrived, hastened to the king. "His majesty judging, like all other prudent men, that the prince's journey proceeded from a deliberate resolve to overcome the difficulties of religion, without which the marriage could not take effect, was infinitely delighted; and approaching a crucifix which was at the head of his bed, said, in the spirit which inspired Charles V., when he saw such an image, which had been shot at by the heretics in the river Elbe, 'Lord, I swear to Thee by the crucified union between God and man, which I adore in Thee, at whose feet I place my lips, that not only shall the coming of the Prince of Wales not

prevail with me, in anything touching Thy holy Catholic religion, to go a step beyond that which Thy vicar, the Roman pontiff, may resolve, but I will keep my resolution even if it were to involve the loss of all the kingdoms which, by Thy favour and mercy, I possess. As to what is temporal and is mine,' he continued, turning to the count, 'see that all the prince's wishes are gratified, in consideration of the obligation under which he has placed us by coming here.' Such an oath as this, the count affirms, he never heard the king take either before or after. It was, however, a very fitting occasion on which to take it." *

Negotiations were carried on, but they were far from satisfactory to either party. The King of Spain's hope proved fallacious. Neither the King of England, it was definitely stated, nor the prince intended to become Catholics, as the Romanist would define Catholicism. Nothing could be more dangerous, said the King of England, than to allow the growing up in his kingdom of a religion so contrary to his feelings and conscience, especially at a time when he did not allow the other side to gain equal strength so as to hold the balance.† The religious difficulty alone would have prevented the alliance, but there was another obstacle. Charles had already fallen in love with Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Henry IV., King of France. He had but a formal interview with the Infanta of Spain, and soon left Madrid. An open rupture between England and Spain was the consequence. Of this we should hardly take notice in a life of Laud, if it were not for the fact, that at this time the breach which occurred between Laud and Bishop Williams, the Lord Keeper, impending long, reached its climax. During

Rupture between England and Spain.

Breach between Williams and Laud.

* Fragmentos historicos. Por Don Juan Antonio de Vera y Figueroa. Camden Society's publications: Spanish Marriage Treaty, p. 326.

† Ibid., p. 219.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

his absence the Marquis of Buckingham was created a duke. Williams, who had at first refused to pay court to that nobleman, thinking that his favour with the king would be short-lived, took an active part in fomenting the discontent of the people, indignant at the report that toleration was to be extended to the papists; and he endeavoured to undermine Buckingham in the royal favour. Laud having, as we have said, received an injunction from Buckingham to look after his interests at Court, was in duty bound to inform his grace of the machinations of Williams, and this duty he performed. Williams drew the popular odium on Buckingham by representing him as the person who first devised the Spanish alliance. It was to Buckingham's influence that Williams was indebted for the high position he occupied in the Court and in the country, and therefore the new duke was particularly indignant at his conduct. He had indeed been for some time less familiar with the Lord Keeper than had been formerly the case, and to this cause we may perhaps attribute in part the present conduct of the Bishop of Lincoln.

Buckingham had indeed become disgusted with Spain, and now was eager to return to England to oppose the marriage with the Infanta; and he, probably with truth, accused the Spanish Court of having acted with duplicity. On his return he would have removed Williams from the Court of James, but from some cause or other, this he was unable to accomplish; it was, however, with no favourable feelings that the Lord Keeper received Laud, who had evidently supplanted him in the favour of Buckingham. Williams imagined, or pretended, that Laud was ungrateful to him; but Laud had by this time discovered that even when Williams had acted favourably towards him, it had chiefly been with a view to his own interests. He soon discovered ample grounds for charging him with being

influenced by a selfish ambition, instead of seeking to maintain the order of the Church and the law of the land.* Laud was also still persistently opposed by Archbishop Abbot, who seemed incapable of believing that there might be some good qualities in one who thought differently from himself, and he succeeded at first in leaving him out of the High Commission. In this insult Williams concurred. But through the influence of Buckingham, Laud's name, after a short delay, was added to the Commission—an honour indeed, but one entailing upon him anxiety and trouble, as in every measure he wished to carry, he found in Williams an opponent. This continued opposition afflicted him much. "It was Sunday," he writes; "I was alone, and languishing with I know not what sadness. I was much concerned at the envy and undeserved hatred borne to me by the Lord Keeper. I took into my hands the Greek Testament, that I might read the portion of the day. I lighted upon the xiii. chapter to the Hebrews; wherein that of David, Psal. lvi., occurred to me, then grieving and fearing, 'The Lord is my helper; I will not fear what man can do unto me!' I thought an example was set to me; and who is not safe under that shield? Protect me, O Lord my God!"† Another entry in the diary, a few days later, shows his intimacy with the prince. He was invited to dinner with the prince, and Charles was very merry, and talked occasionally with his attendants of many things. Among other things, he said, that if he were necessitated to take any particular profession of life, he could not be a lawyer, adding his reasons. "I cannot, saith he, defend a bad, nor yield in a good cause." Laud adds, "May you ever hold this resolution and succeed (most serene

Intimacy with Prince Charles.

* See Philip's Life of Archbishop Williams, Cambridge, pp. 150, 151.

† Diary, Jan. 25, 1623.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

prince) in matters of greater moment, for ever prosperous." *

Well would it have been for Charles if he had acted on this theory, though the assertion of it proved his ignorance of the first principles of legal procedure in England. When a man is accused in a court of justice, it is expected that an advocate, by making 'ex parte' statements, should support the cause which he is known to represent, and that another lawyer, acting on the same principle, but from the opposite side, should make the best of the other cause. The impartial judge, sitting between the two advocates, is thus able to form a judgment; and to neither party would the assertion here used by Prince Charles be applicable.

Meeting of parliament, 1623–4.

Before parliament met, which was not till the 19th of February, 1623–4, the Lord Keeper, Williams, made submission to Buckingham, and was apparently admitted into favour. For political reasons such a reconciliation was necessary on either side. But Buckingham did not take Williams into his confidence; and when he informed Laud of the matter, he told him that the cause of estrangement on the Lord Keeper's part was jealousy of the favour which had been shown to him—which favour was like to be continued.†

Buckingham enjoyed at this time a great, but short-lived popularity, for he was supposed to have been instrumental in breaking off the proposed match between the prince and the Infanta. The Spanish treaty was dissolved by the three estates of the realm—the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Commons of England in parliament assembled. Nothing had been more hateful to the people of England than the idea of this Spanish alliance. Prince Charles, accompanied by Buck-

* Diary, Feb. 1, 1623–4.

† Diary, Feb. 18, 1623–4.

ingham, received an ovation on his return. "All London rang with bells, and flared with bonfires, and resounded all over with such shouts as it is not well possible to express." * The populace was as excited as if some great victory had been won, and Buckingham, for the time, was regarded as almost the saviour of the country.

Laud's measure for the relief of poor clergy condemned by Abbot.

Convocation met at the same time, and we find Laud devising a plan for relieving the poorer clergy, upon whom the subsidies which the king demanded, fell heavily. This plan he communicated to the Duke of Buckingham, who promised to obtain the sanction of the king, and the prince. For his conduct in this affair, he received the commendation even of Williams; but when he brought the subject before Archbishop Abbot, he was surprised to find himself reproached as acting contrary to the interests of the Church. The primate, in great anger, asked Laud what business he had to interfere in the affairs of the Church, and said that no other bishop would have dared to do so; that by consulting a layman in the matter, he had inflicted a wound upon the Church, which it was impossible to heal; and he added that if the duke properly understood him, he would never again permit him to enter his presence.

Laud received this rebuff calmly and with becoming dignity. He thought, he replied, that he had done a very good office for the Church, and so did his betters think. If his grace conceived otherwise, he was sorry that he had offended him; and he hoped that his error (if it was one), being done out of a good mind, and for the support of many poor vicars abroad in the country, who must needs sink under three subsidies a year, was pardonable.

He thought it necessary to acquaint the Duke of Buck-

* Ryve's letter to Usher, 1623. Nichols, iii. p. 927. Diary, March 23. Wood's Annals, vi. pt. 1, p. 351.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

ingham with this circumstance, not with the desire of prejudicing Abbot, but lest his object might be wrongly represented, to the detriment of himself and his cause, to the king and the prince. "So may God bless me, his servant," he writes, "labouring under the pressure of them, who always wished ill to me." *

Visits his livings.

What with the work of parliament, and of convocation and other matters, Laud was busily employed during this year, but yet he found time to visit the livings, which he held *in commendam*, of Ibstock and Creek.† The system of allowing beneficed clergymen to hold other preferments, "in commendam," was at this time productive of much evil. The parishes, as a general rule, were neglected, and the fabrics of the churches were allowed to fall into ruin, because the only interest the non-resident rector had in them was the payment of the income arising from the estates. But Laud was not neglectful of those livings which he thus held together with his bishopric. He visited them, and took heed that things were done according to law.‡ He spent, this year, some time in the country with that object in view.

Returns to London.

His visit to Ibstock was prolonged in consequence of an accident which befel him, by his horse treading on his foot; but he returned to London on the 7th of September, and was immediately called into consultation by the Duke of Buckingham. Of the proposal to confiscate the revenues of Sutton's Hospital, called the Charter House, for the support of the army, mention has already been made; and Laud's answer was decisive. Equally plain was he in giving the duke information about "doctrinal Puritanism," which he did in a tract, drawn up under ten heads; wherein he dealt with the ideas of the Puritans about the observance of the Sabbath; the polity of the

* Diary, Mar. 29, 1624. † Diary, July 23.
‡ Diary, Aug. 8.

Church; the power of the king in ecclesiastical matters; confession and absolution; and the five points on predestination.

On Mid-Lent Sunday, 1625, Laud was appointed to preach at Whitehall. The Court was now feeling anxious about the king, who, being at Theobalds, in Hertfordshire, had been seized with a tertian ague, which baffled the skill of his physicians. This malady, especially in spring, is "rather physical than dangerous," * much anxiety was not, therefore, felt upon the subject. The prince and Buckingham still remained at Whitehall, and were present at Laud's sermon. The preacher was aware soon after he began his discourse of a sensation in his congregation. He surmised the cause, for the report had reached him that the king's illness had taken a serious turn, and had already created anxiety if not alarm. Before he arrived at the middle of his sermon, it was whispered to him that James I. was dead. His own feelings might not have prevented his continuing his discourse, though he had lost a patron who had latterly treated him with consideration and kindness. But the Duke of Buckingham, unaccustomed to self-restraint, sobbed aloud; and, sympathising with the grief depicted on every countenance, Laud abruptly concluded his sermon.† He hastened to console the other mourners. Buckingham seemed almost inconsolable. His grief was great, and, we doubt not, sincere, for the kind old king had treated "Steenie" as a son, and had conferred upon him honours which, except for his partiality to an adopted son, Buckingham was fully aware he could not have enjoyed.

Death of James.

While Laud was administering consolation to the prince and his friend, the silence of the mourning Court was broken by the flourish of trumpets, and by the pro-

Charles I. proclaimed king.

* Fuller, Book x. p. 22. † Diary, Mar. 27, 1625.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

clamation that Charles I. was the King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland.* Charles was in the 25th year of his age; and it was understood that he would carry out with greater consistency and firmness the policy he had inherited from his father.

The king's principles might be surmised when he appointed Laud to preach at the opening of parliament, summoned to meet on the 17th of May. His determination to uphold Church principles was still further evinced when, a few days after his nomination to preach, Laud was desired to present to his majesty a list of the most celebrated preachers and divines, with a notice of the principles, and of the peculiar qualifications of each. This was rendered necessary, because, according to the custom of that time and long after, by a new king new chaplains were appointed. In sending in his list, Laud was to distinguish the Orthodox with the letter O, and the Puritans with the letter P. This was a delicate and invidious task; but it was required by the Duke of Buckingham, that he might deliver the names, classified in that manner to the king, for his private satisfaction.

Evil report against Laud.

Directly it was known that Laud was to be an adviser, and an authority in high places, efforts were made to malign his character. "A certain person," he says, "moved with I know not what envy, blackened my name with King Charles, laying hold, for that purpose, of the error into which, by I know not what fate, I had formerly fallen in the business of the Earl of Devonshire."† Laud never denied that he had committed a grievous offence in solemnising that iniquitous marriage; but nearly twenty years having now elapsed since the event, the raking up of such an old grievance must have been the work, not of one who wanted to clear the Church of a scandal, but of

* Diary, March 27, 1625. † Diary, April 1, 5, 9, 1625.

a malignant enemy who, in fact, paid Laud a compliment, since he had no charge of later date to bring against him. Who the calumniator was, is not mentioned, and if suspicion alights upon some emissary of the primate, or of the Lord Keeper, on both of whom the king looked with indifference, we can produce nothing to confirm the fact. Of this act of malice Laud was informed by the Duke of Buckingham. Instead of being moved by these calumnies the king's confidence in Laud, and his favour towards him, was still further indicated by his directing him to consult with Bishop Andrewes about the business of Convocation; a measure not to be justified because it virtually set aside the archbishop's authority.

Convocation. Andrewes consulted.

Laud was very anxious that the quinquarticular controversy should be discussed, and that the five predestinarian articles, which the synod at Dort had declared to be orthodox, should be authoritatively rejected. By nature impetuous and passionate, he was often charged by his enemies with being intemperate, and even cruel; and it is certain that in many cases his zeal outran his judgment. But in this matter the calmer judgment of Bishop Andrewes prevailed. The saintly Bishop of Winchester deprecated the renewal of a discussion which had already been pregnant with much mischief; and which, at the present time, could not result in much good to the Church. Laud yielded, and the two prelates came to the conclusion, that on account of the number of Calvinists admitted under Abbot's auspices into the lower house, all discussion upon those dogmas should be avoided.

Funeral of King James.

The funeral of King James was conducted with great solemnity, and Charles attended it at Westminster—a fact which must be noticed, as the custom had been for the chief mourner to remain in privacy, his grief being supposed to be too great for public appearance. But the king now "caused this ceremony of sorrow so to yield to

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the substance thereof, and pomp herein, to stoop to piety, that in his person he sorrowfully attended the funerals of his father." * The Lord Keeper, Williams, preached the sermon, which consisted chiefly of a parallel between King James and Solomon, the former monarch, as he said, reigning both better and longer than the latter! The sermon was certainly not in the best taste, and especial fault was found with the preacher for dwelling very strongly on the late king's eloquence, and stating that "no man ever got great power without eloquence." † The courtly prelate had forgotten that Charles suffered from an impediment in his speech.

The Duke of Buckingham was present at the sad ceremony. He left England, however, four days afterwards, to conduct to this country Henrietta Maria. Her marriage with Charles had been celebrated in the church of Notre Dame on the 1st of May,‡ the king appearing by proxy.

Charles in the meanwhile busied himself with reviews of his navy and of his army, expecting a war with Spain. On the 12th of June, being Trinity Sunday, he arrived at Canterbury, that he might have a short period of repose; but on the very night after his arrival he received notice that the queen had arrived at Dover. Thither he went to meet her. She was unusually condescending and gracious to those who were presented to her. The progress from Canterbury to the metropolis was triumphant. The royal party entered their barge at Gravesend, and amidst the cheers of the people, proceeded by water—the high road of London—to Westminster. On the first Sunday after Trinity Laud preached before the king and the Court at Whitehall, but the

Arrival of Henrietta Maria.

* Fuller, Book xi. p. 1. † Sermon, p. 5.

‡ Diary, May 1, 11, 1625. See Life of Abbot.

sermon was a sad one. The court was prepared for festivities, but it was soon known that in consequence of an extraordinary season of rain, the plague had again broken out with great virulence in London.

Fast on account of the plague.

When the convocation met, an order was sent by the king to the upper house, commanding the Archbishop of Canterbury, and six other bishops, of whom Laud was one, to appoint a day for fasting and prayer; or, in the words of Laud himself, "to advise together concerning a public fast, and a form of prayer, to implore the divine mercy against the spreading of the pestilence, and to avert the miseries of a famine, the occurrence of which the extraordinary wet weather seemed to portend." They were at the same time to implore the divine blessing upon the fleet now ready to put to sea.* Three days before the public fast was observed, Laud, having dined with the king at Windsor, went to the house of the Bishop of Gloucester. One of the servants of the bishop was suddenly seized with the plague. He died next day. Those who had been present in the bishop's house might well be filled with alarm, lest they also should have the contagion. "God be merciful to me and the rest," writes Bishop Laud, who evidently was much alarmed, and ready to imagine any slight ailment as a sign of the plague. "For," he continues, "that night I returned, being become lame on the sudden, through I know not what humour falling down on my left leg, or (as R. A. thought) by the biting of bugs. I grew well in two days." †

The plague seems to have been chiefly confined to the lower classes of society, probably on account of the poverty of their living and the defective sewerage. The mortality was terrible. Between July 21st and July 27th, there died 2,491 persons; and in August no less than

* Diary, June 24, 1625. † Diary, July 17, 1625.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

4,465 persons perished in one week. The number of deaths from the plague in London alone was estimated at 35,417, a fearful list, when the comparatively small number of the inhabitants is considered.* The appointed fast was held on Wednesday, July 20, with great solemnity and serious devotion throughout the country.

The queen.

The grand mistake of Charles's marriage with a Romish princess began in very early days to make itself felt. He found a difficulty in preserving his consistency in granting the full toleration which the French required, and in maintaining the Protestant cause, which the Commons declared to be in danger by the alliance with France. Buckingham soon perceived the malign influence of the queen over her admiring husband, and during the remainder of his life her influence was less mischievous in politics than it afterwards became. That influence nevertheless the people dreaded, and the Puritan leaders were always ready to fan into flame the feeling of alarm. It was unfortunate for them that Charles did not give any sign of preference to the Church of Rome. He remained steady to the principles of the Church of England. Yet a cry must be raised, or Puritanism would languish. A sore requires some irritating substance to be applied, if it is to be kept open,† and "No Arminianism" was to act as the blister.

Puritan leaders.

Mountague's book.

A book that had been written by Dr. Richard Mountague, entitled "New Gagg for an old Goose"; which was followed by another, in which similar opinions were more strongly maintained, under the title "Appello Cæsarem," was the occasion of an outcry amongst those who held Calvinian doctrines. The writer had spoken disrespectfully of the Synod of Dort, and the Puritans asked what mattered such trifles as the Articles of Reli-

* D'Ewes' Journal, &c. (Halliday), pp. 273, 278, &c.

† Cyp. Ang., p. 135.

gion, agreed on by the bishops and clergy of England, compared with the determinations of that great Synod, which Mountague had vilified? The unfortunate man was cited before the House, committed to the custody of the serjeant-at-arms, and required to find bail of 2,000*l.* for his appearance in the next session.

Dr. Davenant.

The Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. John Davenant, in a letter to Dr. Ward, Master of Sidney College, speaks very severely of Mountague. He wishes he had a more modest "conceipt" of himself, and a less base opinion of all others who jump not with him in his mongrel opinions. Again, in another letter, Dr. Davenant writes: "His (Mountague's) opinion concerning predestination, and total falling from grace, is undoubtedly contrary to the common tenor of the English Church, ever since we were born. For Dr. Overall, I know not to the contrary, but it was his opinion that some, not elected by the working of universal sufficient grace, did, or might sometimes attain to an estate of justification and regeneration, and yet fall away and perish. But for Luther and Bucer, I am resolved that they never thought any reprobate to have ever obtained the state of a truly faithful, justified, adopted and sanctified man. But they affirm that faith, and grace of the Spirit cannot stand together with impenitency in any mortal sin; meaning thereby the act of faith apprehending justification, and the working of the Spirit sealing unto us our justification. But that the state of regeneration, or adoption, or justification (as it respects all sin forepassed) was thereby dissolved, they never thought." *

It was quite right that Davenant and the Puritans should express their opinions, and very likely Dr. Mountague was not wise in publishing his ideas. But when, for

* Tan. MSS. 2, lxxii. p. 68. Note in Brewer's Fuller, book xi. sec. 6, par. 14.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud.

1633–45.

Appeal of Laud and other bishops in Mountague's behalf.

the expression of doctrines which were distasteful to the Calvinists, Mountague was summoned before the House of Commons, and committed to custody, Laud thought it necessary to interfere. In conjunction with the Bishops of Rochester and Oxford, he addressed a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, imploring him to engage the king, by the exercise of his prerogative, to nullify the persecution by deciding the matter himself.

The letter is interesting :—

"May it please your Grace,—We are bold to be suitors to you in behalf of the Church of England, and a poor member of it, Mr. Mountague, at this time not a little distressed. We are not strangers to his person, but it is the cause we are bound to be tender of.

"The cause we conceive (under correction of better judgment) concerns the Church of England nearly; for that Church, when it was reformed from the superstitious opinions broached or maintained by the Church of Rome, refused the apparent and dangerous errors, and would not be too busy with every particular school-point. The cause why she held this moderation was, because she could not be able to preserve any unity amongst Christians, if men were forced to subscribe to curious particulars disputed in schools. Now the opinions which at this time trouble many men in the late work of Mr. Mountague, are, some of them, such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England; and those he is bound to maintain. Some of them such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for learned men to abound in their own sense, so they keep themselves peaceable and distract not the Church; and therefore to make any man subscribe to school-opinions may justly seem hard in the Church of Christ, and was one great fault of the Council of Trent. And to affright them from those opinions in which they

have (as they are bound) subscribed to the Church, as it is worse in itself, so it may be the mother of greater danger. May it please your grace further to consider, that when the clergy submitted themselves in the time of Henry VIII., the submission was so made that if any difference, doctrinal or other, fell in the Church, the king and the bishops were to be judges of it in a national synod or convocation; the king first giving leave, under his broad seal, to handle the points in difference. But the Church never submitted to any other judge, neither, indeed, can she, even if she would. And we humbly desire your grace to consider, and then to move his most gracious majesty (if you shall think fit), what dangerous consequences may follow upon it."

The consequences are detailed under five heads; the main points being that if any other judge were allowed, there would be a departure from the ordinance of Christ and the continual course and practice of the Church; and the Church would suffer in respect of her authority, there being no knowing what might "next be struck at." Also that certain opinions, which had been treated of at Lambeth, and were ready to be published, but which Queen Elizabeth had caused to be suppressed, had received countenance at the Synod of Dort; and the Synod at Dort was that of another nation, and its decrees could be in no ways binding. "Our hope is," say the bishops, in their letter, "that the Church of England will be well advised, and more than once over, before she admits a foreign synod, especially of such a Church as condemneth her discipline and manner of government, to say no more." The letter concludes with a tribute to Mountague's character, and is signed by J. Roffens. (Buckeridge), J. Oxon. (Howson), and W. Meneven. (Laud).*

* Laud's Letters, No. vi.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The king, persuaded by his ministers, who appreciated the meaning of this letter, revoked the proceedings of parliament, and reserved to himself the right of investigating the conduct of his own chaplains, of whom Mountague was one. This information was given to the parliament on the 9th of July, when the king intimated that what had been there said and resolved, without consulting him, in Mountague's cause, was not pleasing to him.*

Proceedings against Mountague revoked.

Parliament at Oxford.

Soon after, the parliament adjourned, and the plague still raging in London, it was summoned to resume its session at Oxford. Little, however, could be done. Charles was in want of money, but the Puritans, harping upon their constant theme, the royal autocracy, refused the subsidies. They still required fresh concessions, which Charles still refused to grant; and with great inconsistency the Calvinists, who had before violently condemned King James for not supporting the Elector, now refused to enable his successor to aid his brother-in-law; although by so doing he would uphold the Protestant interest in Germany. Some in reality, but others in pretence, suspected the king's sincerity in religion. With a popish wife he certainly laid himself open to the charge until his sincerity was by his sufferings brought to the proof. The uncompromising attitude of the members made the king anxious to dissolve his parliament, and he found a pretext in the fact that even now at Oxford also the plague had made its appearance.† After a session of twelve days the parliament was dissolved.

Parliament dissolved.

Laud now seized the opportunity to again visit his diocese. He was at this time in a precarious state of health; and in the opinion of the physicians he was never weaker.‡

Laud revisits his diocese.

* Diary, June 9, 1625. Rushworth, i. 7.

† One of the first victims was Dr. Edward Challoner, Principal of St. Alban's Hall. Wood's Athen., i. p. 496.

‡ Diary, Aug. 15, 1625.

This circumstance accounts for the nervous dreams with which he was troubled, and of which he gives minute descriptions in his diary.

Notwithstanding the delicacy of his health his attention to the duties of his calling was not relaxed. Difficult and dangerous as travelling was, he visited the most distant parts of his diocese, and proved himself to be what was at that time called "a painful preacher." Such was the state of the roads, over mere tracts of barren heath, or else through a mass of mud, with ruts and pitfalls innumerable, that, in one journey only, we read of his coach being twice upset. After having spent two days at Brecknock, transacting business, he writes: "Aug. 24. Wednesday. The feast of St. Bartholomew. I came safely (thanks be to God) to my own house at Aberguilly, although my coach had twice that day been overturned between Aber-markes and my house. The first time I was in it, but the second time it was empty." *

He consecrates his private chapel.

At Aberguilly he consecrated the chapel which had lately been added to his house, and had been erected, as we before had occasion to remark, at his own expense. The form of consecration was that used by the learned Bishop Andrewes, a form which is the basis of that now in general use throughout the dioceses of England, though at the time it was mentioned as a further proof of Laud's tendency to Rome.

The building and arrangement of this chapel had long been a matter of pleasing interest to the bishop, and he now writes:—

"I named it the chapel of St. John Baptist, in grateful remembrance of St. John Baptist's College in Oxford, of which I had been first fellow and afterwards president. And this I had determined to do. But another thing

* Diary, Aug. 24, 1625.

CHAP. XXXIV. William Laud. 1633-45.

intervened (of no ill omen, as I hope) of which I had never thought. It was this. On Saturday, the evening immediately preceding the consecration, while I was intent at prayer, I know not how, it came strongly into my mind, that the day of the beheading of St. John Baptist, was very near. When prayers were finished, I consulted the calendar. I found that day to fall upon Monday, to wit, the 29th of August, not upon Sunday. I could have wished it had fallen upon that same day when I consecrated the chapel. However, I was pleased that I should perform that solemn consecration at least on the eve of that festival. For upon that day, his majesty King James heard my cause about the election to the presidentship of St. John's, for three hours together at least: and with great justice delivered me out of the hands of my powerful enemies."

In Ember week, the bishop was prepared to hold an ordination, but only one candidate for holy orders presented himself. This person being, upon examination, found unfit, the bishop declined to ordain him, and with a solemn exhortation dismissed him.*

His recreation.

In the midst of his work, the bishop found time to give a day to recreation. Having preached at Carmarthen on Sunday Oct. 9, the next day he says: "I went on horseback up to the mountains. It was a very bright day for the time of year, and so warm that on our return I and my company dined in the open air, in a place called Pente Cragg where my registrary had his country house." †

But he was soon summoned to London, or thought it his duty to go there, especially when the news reached him that Bishop Williams had been deprived of his office as Lord Keeper. The Lord Keeper had not been on

* Diary, Sept. 24, 1625. † Ibid., Oct. 10, 1625.

good terms with the Duke of Buckingham, even in the reign of King James. Jealous of the duke's influence, and thinking that his influence with the king would not last, Williams had ventured to make an enemy of the favourite. He endeavoured to retrace his steps, but Buckingham was not slow to perceive that Williams thought only of his own interests. And now the duke discovered, or thought he had discovered, that the bitterness of the parliament against him had been, to some extent, fostered by the intrigues and practices of the Lord Keeper. When these surmises or facts were represented to the king, his majesty despatched the Controller of the royal household to the Lord Keeper, to demand the Great Seal. It was some consolation to Williams, when he found that his successor was not to be Laud, but the attorney-general, Sir Thomas Coventry. There is no reason to suppose that Laud had anything to do with the removal of Williams, but Williams was not well pleased when the Bishop of Durham, being in a bad state of health, requested Laud to act as his deputy, and to wait upon his majesty as clerk of the closet. Laud accepted the trust; and from this time we may date the confidence and favour with which he was honoured by the king.

Resignation of Lord Keeper Williams.

Laud clerk of the closet.

Soon after Laud's return to London, letters were issued in the king's name, to the archbishops, bearing date December 15, 1625, requiring them to take heed "that no good means be neglected on their part for discovering, finding out, and apprehending of Jesuits and Seminary priests, and other seducers of his people to the Romish religion; or for repressing popish recusants, and delinquents of that sort, against whom they were to proceed by excommunication, and other censures of the Church, not omitting other lawful means to bring them forth to public justice. And that vigilant care be taken with the rest of the clergy for the repressing of those, who being ill-

Royal letters issued against Papists and Puritans. A.D. 1625.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

affected to the true religion here established, they keep more close and secret their ill and dangerous affections that way, and as well by their example, as by secret and underhand sleights and means, much encourage and increase the growth of Popery and superstition, in sundry parts of this kingdom." *

Omission of reference to the Puritans.

The archbishop, Abbot, on receipt of these letters, transmitted copies thereof to his suffragans, and required them to conform to the will of his majesty. But it would appear that the archbishop omitted that portion which referred to the Calvinists. For the Bishop of St. David's, in sending orders to the chancellor, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers of his diocese, referred merely to the professed recusants, and required that a list of all such as had been presented and proceeded against, should be sent to him yearly at Easter, to be presented by him to the archbishop.† No mention is made of the practices of the Puritan faction, and considering the character of Laud, his firm opposition to Calvinian schism, and his boldness in upholding the truth, the omission can hardly be supposed to have been made by him without authority.

Other news awaited his return from his diocese of a private, rather than of a public character. Having arrived at the house of his friend, Windebank, at Hains Hill, he learned that to the Duke of Buckingham ("then negotiating for the public in the Low Countries") a son had been born. For his friend he rejoiced, and the following letter is interesting, as showing the affection he bore towards the duke:—

His letter to the duke.

"I am heartily glad to hear your lordship is so well returned, and so happily as to meet so great joy. God hath, among many others His great blessings (and I know

* Cyp. Ang., p. 134.

† Letter to Dr. Aubrey, Chancellor of the Diocese of St. David's. Works, vi. p. 248. Prynne's Hidden Works, p. 78.

your grace so esteems them), sent you now this extraordinary one, a son to inherit his father's honours, and the rest of God's blessings upon both. So soon as I came to the end of my journey, I met the happy news of God's blessing upon your grace, and it seasoned all the hard journey I have had out of Wales through the snow. When I had rested myself a little at my friend's house (Mr. Windebank), I came to Windsor in hope to have been so happy as to meet your grace at the great solemnity; but when I came I found that which I had suspected, that your grace's greater joy would carry you further. . . . I have no means to do your grace any service but by my prayers; and they do daily attend, and shall ever while I breathe to utter them. I leave your grace and all your home blessings to the protection of the Almighty." *

Commission to arrange matters for the coronation.

Christmas Day this year fell on a Sunday, and Laud preached at Hurst. Proceeding the next day to Hampton Court, where the king was at that time residing, he received information that he was appointed with certain other prelates to consult on the ceremonies of the coronation. The first meeting of the commissioners was fixed for the Wednesday following, at Whitehall, when Laud was appointed to act as their secretary. He went back at once to Hains Hill, "for there," he says, "not knowing anything of these matters, I had left my necessary papers with my trunks." † On his return to London, he took up his abode in his own house in Westminster, instead of the house of his friend, the Bishop of Durham, where for the previous four years he had been accustomed to reside when in London. He was driven from his old home, because the Bishop of Durham's house was appointed to be the residence of the ambassador extraordinary of the King of France.

* Works, vol. vi. pt. 1, p. 247. † Diary, Jan. 2, 1625–6.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The commission of which Laud was secretary met frequently for the purpose, and were mainly occupied in settling the form of the coronation according to ancient precedent. There was considerable difficulty in the matter, for though Edward VI. and Elizabeth had been crowned according to the ancient Catholic ritual of the Church, at the coronation of King James alterations had been made and the arrangements had been very hasty and incomplete. The commissioners determined that there should be no incompleteness in the coronation of King Charles, and all the details were carefully discussed and prearranged. But Laud had also other business to transact. By the royal command, he, with the Bishops of London (Montaigne), Durham (Neile), Winchester (Andrewes), and Rochester (Buckeridge), met on the 16th of January to hold consultation as to what was to be done in the case of Dr. Mountague. He was also in a commission, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury was the head, to draw up a form of prayer for the abatement of the plague. Moreover he received the king's command to be prepared to preach at the opening of parliament on the 6th day of February. Weak as he was in health, Laud's spirit did not shrink from the duty thus imposed upon him. The amount of work he undertook and thoroughly performed may astonish even those who have not such impediments to encounter when entering on a career of usefulness.

Appointed to act as dean at the coronation.

Laud received an official notification from the Archbishop of Canterbury on January 16, that, at the coronation he was appointed to act as Dean of Westminster. It appears that the king, permitting his prejudices to overcome his sense of justice, would not permit the Bishop of Lincoln, who held the deanery *in commendam* with his bishopric, to officiate at the ceremony. The king, however, had the good taste to request Williams to make choice of his deputy on the occasion. Williams, with

equal courtesy, and with good policy, sent a list of the prebendaries of Westminster, requesting his majesty to take his choice.* He thus escaped the annoyance of nominating Laud, whom, as he was the only bishop amongst the prebendaries, he could not pass over, but declined what might have been regarded as compliant if he had himself made the appointment. On the 23rd of January, Laud had ready a Book of the Ceremonies of the Coronation in accordance with the paper consigned to him by the king; and on the 31st day of the month the bishops and other peers, who had been nominated by the king to consult about the ceremonies of the coronation, held their final meeting. They had received the royal command that the ancient precedents should be strictly observed, and they now, in a body, waited upon his majesty. The king viewed all the regalia, and put on St. Edward's tunic. He caused the rubrics of direction to be read; and the regalia were then taken back to the church of Westminster and laid up in their place.

Fuller observes that although this coronation does not come within the pales and park, it does come within the purlieus of ecclesiastic history; and he enters into the subject with some detail. He says: "I have insisted the longer on this subject, moved thereunto by this consideration, that if it be the last solemnity performed on an English king of this kind; posterity will conceive my pains well bestowed, because on the last. But if hereafter Providence shall assign England another king, though the transaction herein be not wholly precedential, something of state may be chosen out, grateful for imitation."† The biographer of Archbishop Laud enters into detail, because the enemies of Laud at a later period of his life adverted to the ceremonies used at the coronation of Charles I., as

* Cyp. Ang., p. 138.

† Fuller, xi. 18.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

one of their grounds of attack on that prelate. There was an omission in one respect relating to the procession, in which it had been usual for the kings of England to ride from the Tower, through the city to Westminster. Although a sharp winter had tended to put an end to the plague which had lately been raging, yet it was thought scarcely safe to collect a great crowd in the narrow streets of London where the air was still said to be infectious. Such a procession also would have cost three score thousand pounds, to be disbursed on scarlet for the king's train—"a sum which, if demanded of his exchequer, would scarce receive a satisfactory answer thereunto. And surely some who since condemn him for want of state in omitting this royal pageant, would have condemned him more for prodigality had he made use thereof." *

Coronation of King Charles I.

It was on a bright "sunshining" day that King Charles, attended by a splendid retinue, proceeded to Westminster Abbey, there to be crowned according to the ancient custom and the rites of the Church. A vast crowd had assembled to witness the proceedings, which, though it displayed no enthusiasm, was orderly and respectful.†

When the people, according to custom, were called upon, says one who was present, to testify by acclamation their readiness to receive Charles as the undoubted king of the realm, they were silent. But it does not follow that this was any mark of disrespect; the archbishop was both old and infirm, and perhaps was scarcely heard. When the Earl Marshal called upon the people to shout they responded,‡ and not only so, but when some time

* Fuller, xi. 33.

† Diary, Feb. 2. The account of the coronation is drawn up from the history of Laud's Troubles, from Heylyn and from Fuller. Fuller received his account from a doctor of divinity still alive, and an exact observer of all pageants. See "The Appeal," p. iii. p. 4.

‡ Letter of Sir S. D'Ewes. Ellis, Orig. Lett., iii. 213.

before, a member of the House of Commons had exclaimed, "We can hope everything from the king who now governs us," the exclamation was cordially received, and obtained a ready acquiescence. The applause may be in part attributed to the absence of the queen. Her absence was the result of an impolitic bigotry on her part, a determination not to take part in a Protestant service—that service in fact being the ancient office according to which the kings of England had in all ages been crowned.* The queen had the unaccountable bad taste and feeling, to show her contempt of a solemn ceremony by indulging in dances, and other frivolities, in full view of the public.

As we witnessed at the coronation of George IV., King Charles met the officers of state, and those upon whom hereditary offices devolved at a coronation, in Westminster Hall. A procession from the hall to the abbey advanced in the following order:—The aldermen of London, ushered by an herald; eighty knights of the Bath in their robes, each having an esquire to support, and page to attend him; the king's serjeants-at-law, the solicitor, and attorney, masters of requests and judges; privy councillors that were knights, and officers of the king's household; barons of the kingdom, bareheaded, in their parliament robes, with swords by their sides; the bishops, with scarlet gowns—their parliamentary dress—and lawn sleeves, bareheaded; the viscounts and earls in their coronation robes, with coronetted caps on their heads; the officers of state for the day, the Archbishop of Canterbury being one; the Earls of Dorset, Essex, and Kent, carrying the three swords, naked; the Earl of Montgomery, carrying the spurs; the Earl of Sussex,

* The Coronation Service is probably not only the most ancient of English use, but the most ancient extant in all the world. It is found in the Pontifical of Archbishop Egbert, and is printed from Martini by Maskell, iii. 74.

CHAP. XXXIV. William Laud. 1633–45.

carrying the globe and cross upon it; the Bishop of London, carrying the golden cup, and the Bishop of Winchester, carrying the golden plate, for the Communion; the Earl of Rutland, carrying the sceptre; the Marquis Hamilton, carrying the sword of state, naked; the Earl of Pembroke, carrying the crown. The Lord Mayor of London, in a crimson velvet gown, carried a short sceptre, but it does not appear in which part of the procession he took his place. Immediately before the king, went the Earl of Arundel, as earl marshal of England, and the Duke of Buckingham, as lord high constable of England for that day. The west gate of the abbey was thrown open at the approach of the cortége. Under a rich canopy, borne by the barons of the cinque ports, the king entered. He was clad in white, instead of purple; a fact which was afterwards commented on, white being the emblematical colour of the saints. His train, six yards long, was of purple velvet, and was held up by the Lord Compton, and the Lord Viscount Doncaster. He was supported on one side by the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Neile, and on the other by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Lake. At the door of the abbey the prebendaries of Westminster appeared in their rich copes, and the Bishop of St. David's, acting as dean, delivered into his majesty's hand the staff of King Edward the Confessor. At the upper end of the church, from the choir to the altar, was an elevated platform. Three chairs were appointed for the king in several places: one of repose; the second the ancient chair of coronation; and the third placed on a high square of five stairs' ascent, being the chair of state, such as we have seen in recent coronations. After a short repose, Archbishop Abbot, bowed down by age and illness, yet determined to do his duty, presented his majesty to the lords and commons, east,

west, north, and south, as the undoubted king of this realm; and, under circumstances already mentioned, demanded, whether they were prepared to render the service due to him. The king presented himself to the people assembled in the nave, bareheaded, and four times he was greeted with loud acclamations. He then sat for a short time in his chair of repose. After the sermon, not a very judicious one, preached by the Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Senhouse, Archbishop Abbot, vested in a rich cope, tendered to the king, kneeling before the altar, the coronation oath. The royal robes, from the weight of which the king was now liberated, were offered on the altar; and the king stood for a while stripped to his doublet and hose. He was now led by the archbishop, and by the Bishop of St. David's acting as dean, and placed in the chair of coronation. A close canopy was spread over him; and while the Lord Archbishop was anointing his head, shoulders, arms, and hands with a costly ointment, the choir sang an anthem, "Zadok the priest anointed Solomon King." The king was led in his doublet and hose, with a white coif on his head, to the Communion table. Then the ancient habiliments of Edward the Confessor were brought forth, and with them he was arrayed. His majesty returning to the chair of coronation, received the crown of King Edward, presented by Laud as Dean of Westminster, and it was placed on the king's head by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the choir singing an anthem, "Thou shalt put a crown of pure gold upon his head." Hereupon the earls and viscounts put on their coronets—the barons and the bishops standing bareheaded. King Edward's sword was girt about the king, which he took off again, and offered up on the Communion table. The Duke of Buckingham, as master of the horse, put on his spurs, and the king now stood forth a crowned and anointed sovereign. He

offered first gold, and then silver at the altar, and afterwards bread and wine, which were to be used at the Holy Communion. His Majesty was conducted to the chair of state, the choir singing the "Te Deum." The king received an oath of homage from the Duke of Buckingham as lord high constable of that day, and the duke swore all the nobility at his majesty's knees, to be his homagers. Each touched the crown on his head, and protested that they were ready to spend their blood to maintain it to him, and his lawful heirs.

The king then took a scroll of parchment out of his bosom, and gave it to the Lord Keeper, who read it four several times, at the east, west, north, and south sides of the platform, the object being to proclaim a pardon to all the king's subjects who would take it, under the broad seal.

From the throne his majesty was conducted to the Communion table. The Lord Archbishop, kneeling at the north side, offered the customary prayers and sang the Nicene Creed. The Bishops of Llandaff and Norwich, and the Bishops of Durham and St. David's, in rich copes, knelt with his majesty, and received the Holy Communion. "Gloria in Excelsis" was sung by the choir, and the solemnity was concluded by the benediction, pronounced by the Lord Archbishop. The king disrobed himself in King Edward's Chapel, from whence he came forth in a short robe of red velvet, lined with ermine, and with a crown of his own upon his head, which was set with very precious stones. The royal procession returned to Whitehall by water, in splendid barges, and the king reached home about four o'clock in the afternoon, having entered the abbey a little before ten.

Little anticipating the attacks that, at a future period, would be made upon him for his share in the ceremonial, Laud regarded the coronation with feelings of satisfaction.

What was done was done in accordance with precedent, and though there was a hostile faction ready and watchful to take notice of whatever might create prejudice or cause offence, the law was strictly observed and no one deteriorated from it or added to it. In truth, immediate offence had not been taken. In the midst of an incredible concourse of people, Laud says, nothing was lost, or broken, or disordered. "The theatre was clear and free for the king, the peers, and the business in hand; and I heard some of the nobility saying to the king on their return, that they had never seen any solemnity, although much less, performed with so little noise and so great order." *

Faults found with the committee at a later period.

Laud was indeed charged by factious opponents in after times with making alterations in the prayers and ceremonies at the coronation. But, as Fuller observes, "this was done, if done at all, not by Laud, but by a committee of which Laud was only one member." We add, that the whole was sanctioned by Archbishop Abbot, who, if he would sanction alterations, would certainly not regard with favour such innovations as Laud was accused of introducing. One ground of attack was that the coronation oath was altered. But in point of fact, the form of the oath was substantially the same as that which was used in the time of Edward II., and which is the most ancient we have in print. Comparing the form of the oath administered to King Charles with that ancient form, we find interpolated the words, "according to the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel established in this kingdom, agreeable to the prerogative of the kings thereof, and the ancient customs of the realm,"† and nothing more. The oath in full, taken by the king, was this:—Archbishop Abbot, addressing his majesty, said, "Sir, will you grant and keep, and by your oath

* Diary, Feb. 2, 1625.

† Rymer's Acta Regia, iii. p. 63.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

confirm to the people of England, the laws and customs granted to them by the kings of England, your lawful and religious predecessors, and, namely, the laws, customs, and practices granted to the clergy by the glorious king St. Edward, your predecessor, according to the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel established in this kingdom, agreeable to the prerogative of the kings thereof, and the ancient customs of this realm? Will you keep peace and godly agreement, according to your power, both to God, the holy Church, the clergy, and the people? Will you, to your power, cause law, justice, and discretion, mercy and truth, to be executed to your judgment? Will you grant to hold and keep the laws and rightful customs which the commonalty of this your kingdom have, and will you defend and uphold them to the honour of God, so much as in you lieth?" *

Prynne charged Laud with introducing as a novelty or innovation the phrase "agreeable to the king's prerogative"; † and, with his usual unfairness, accounted Laud solely responsible for what was arranged and settled by a committee of learned divines. It was also urged, as an offence, that the unction was made in the form of a cross, and the address that was made to the king after the unction, was not likely to please those who had no idea of the validity of holy orders. The address was:—

"Stand and hold fast from henceforth the place to which you have been heir by the succession of your forefathers, being now delivered to you by the authority of Almighty God, and by the hands of us and all the bishops, and servants of God; and as you see the clergy to come nearer to the altar than others, so remember that in place convenient you give them greater honour; that

* Rushworth, i. p. 200. † Canterburie's Doome, p. 318.

the mediator of God and man may establish you in the kingly throne, to be the mediator between the clergy and the laity, that you may reign for ever with Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who with the Father and Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth for ever." There was also a passage which had not been used since the reign of Henry VI., in a prayer at this time re-introduced :—" Let him obtain favour for his people, like Aaron in the tabernacle, Elisha in the waters, Zacharias in the temple ; give him Peter's key of discipline, Paul's doctrine." This, says Fuller, " we may call a Protestant passage, though anciently used in popish times, as fixing more power than the pope will allow—jealous that any should finger Peter's keys except himself."

The display of a massive silver crucifix on the Communion table was also brought forward by the Puritans as a charge against Laud. If such a crucifix was found amongst the regalia, it was most probably displayed ; but it is uncertain whether this was the case or not. At all events, Laud's business, as a member of the royal committee, and acting as Dean of Westminster, was simply to see that everything among the regalia was in a state of preservation. But it seems hardly fair that he should be afterwards arraigned for what was done under the eyes, and with the tacit sanction of his superior, Archbishop Abbot, who was, if the cross was displayed, the person to object. This Laud himself alleged on his trial, not as an excuse, for he did not remember the fact of the display of the crucifix, but as a reason why judgment on such a subject should not be given against him. " They say," these are his own words, " there was a crucifix amongst the regalia, and that it stood upon the altar at the coronation, and that I did not except against it. My predecessor (Abbot) executed at that time, and, I believe, would have excepted against the crucifix had it

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

stood there. *But I remember not any there.* Yet if there were, if my predecessor approved the standing of it, or were content to connive at it, it would have been made but a scorn had I quarrelled at it." *

So minute was the investigation, that the enemies of Laud found out that the word "perform" was used once, instead of the word "conform"; and that the king was instructed to answer in one case "I will," instead of "I do."

The fact is that Laud, acting as dean, endeavoured to have all things done "decently and in order." In this endeavour he succeeded, and the coronation was conducted according to the rites of the Church. He felt that that was done decently which was done, as St. Augustine says, according to the order of the Church; but to such decency and order the Puritans were opposed. They had a perfect right to express their opinions; but when they changed their arena from that of politics to religion, and invented charges against Laud, bringing against him railing accusations and false assertions, their conduct was unjustifiable. If they were led astray by the egregious forgeries and falsehoods of Prynne, they were almost as much to blame, for they had no right to accept his assertions without examining his documents.

Laud had to bear the brunt of the factious opposition of the Puritans to the ceremonies of the coronation of King Charles; but, as he says, he was purely ministerial both in the preparation and at the coronation itself, supplying the place of the Dean of Westminster, and acting under the authority of Archbishop Abbot.

The second parliament of Charles assembled on the 6th

* Laud's Troubles and Trial, p. 318. Works, iv. 211. I find that the Crucifix is mentioned among the Regalia in an indenture between Bishop Andrewes and Dr. Neile, when the latter was Dean of Westminster. MSS. Ashmole, No. 837, Art. xlii.

of February, when the opening sermon was preached by Bishop Laud before the king and the House of Lords. It is among his printed sermons, and the text was taken from the 4th and 5th verses of the 112th Psalm. In this sermon he urged strongly the importance of unity to the wellbeing of the State, whether ecclesiastical or civil. "Would you keep," he says, "the State in unity? in any case take heed of breaking the peace of the Church. The peace of the State depends much upon it; for divide Christ in the minds of men, or divide the minds of men about their hopes of salvation in Christ, and then tell me where will be the unity?" Laud mentions that on February 26th, the first Sunday in Lent, he presented this sermon to his majesty, as printed by his majesty's command.*

Laud's sermon at the opening of parliament.

One of the first things which engaged the attention of the Commons in the parliament now assembled, was the case of Mountague. He was again assailed for what they called Arminianism, though Mountague earnestly disclaimed the tenets of Arminius, or any other private writer, appealing for the support of his views to the writings of the primitive Church.† A consultation had been held, by order of the king, in January (as mentioned before), when the prelates appointed for the purpose of considering the matter, had come to the conclusion expressed in the following letter to the Duke of Buckingham:—

Mountague's case.

"Upon your last letters directed to the Bishop of Winchester, signifying his majesty's pleasure, that taking to him the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, or some of them, he and they should take into consideration the business concerning Mr. Mountague's late book, and deliver their opinions touching the

Letter to the Duke of Buckingham.

* Diary, Feb. 26, 1625. † Appello, p. 10.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

same, for the preservation of the truth, and the peace of the Church of England, together with the safety of Mr. Mountague's person: we have met and considered, and, for our particulars, do think that Mr. Mountague, in his book, hath not affirmed anything to be the doctrine of the Church of England, but that which in our opinions is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereunto. And for the preservation of the peace of the Church, we in humility do conceive that his majesty shall do most graciously to prohibit all parties, members of the Church of England, any further controverting of these questions by public preaching or writing, or any other way, for the disturbance of the peace of this Church for the time to come. And for anything that may further concern Mr. Mountague's person in that business, we humbly commend him to his majesty's gracious favour and pardon." *

Articles against Mountague.

Whatever may now be thought of this prohibition, it was at the time of its publication regarded as a mild measure; and the Puritans were not disposed to act with equal forbearance. Whether the existence of this letter was known to the Commons is uncertain; at all events it was disregarded; and on the motion of Mr. Pym the House resolved, "That Mr. Mountague endeavoured to reconcile England to Rome, and alienate the king's affection from his well-affected subjects." The Committee of Religion, now, for the first time, appointed by the Commons, drew up five articles against Mountague, of which the following is the substance:—

That in the "Answer to the Gag," and in the "Appeal," "Richard Mountague doth maintain and affirm that the Church of Rome is, and ever was a true Church, since it was a Church."

* Letter No. ix. Laud's Works.

Referring to the sacraments; that "Richard Mountague in his books doth maintain and affirm that the Church of Rome hath ever remained firm upon the same foundation of sacraments and doctrine instituted by God."

Concerning ceremonies and masses; that "the said Richard Mountague doth maintain that the controverted points are of a lesser and inferior nature, of which a man may be ignorant without any danger of his soul at all; a man may resolve to oppose this or that, without peril of perishing for ever:"

That "Richard Mountague doth affirm and maintain that images may be used for the instruction of the ignorant and excitation of devotion:"

That "the said Richard Mountague, in his book, entituled 'A Treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints,' hath affirmed and maintained, that saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends; and that it may be admitted that some saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as angels also have, over certain persons and countries, by special deputation; and that it is no impiety so to believe:"

Also that "in the said book, called the 'Appeal,' he doth maintain and affirm, that men justified may fall away and depart from the state which once they had; they may arise again, and become new men possibly, but not certainly nor necessarily:"

That "he hath changed divers words, both in the Book of Homilies, and in the Book of Common Prayer, endeavouring thereby to lay a most wicked and malicious scandal upon the Church of England, as if she did herein differ from the reformed Churches beyond the seas; and did consent to those pernicious errors which are commonly called Arminianism:"

That "he, contrary to his duty and allegiance, en-

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

deavoured to raise great factions and divisions in the commonwealth, by casting the odious and scandalous name of Puritans upon such of his majesty's loving subjects as conform themselves to the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church of England: "

That "the scope and end of the said Richard Mountague in the books before mentioned is to give encouragement to popery, and to withdraw his majesty's subjects from true religion established to the Roman superstition: "

And that "the said Richard Mountague hath inserted into the book, called the 'Appeal,' divers passages dishonourable to the late king, his majesty's father, of famous memory; full of bitterness, railing, and injurious speeches to other persons, disgraceful and contemptible to many worthy divines, both of this kingdom, and other reformed Churches beyond the seas: "

"All which offences being to the dishonour of God, and of most mischievous effect and consequence against the good of this Church and commonwealth of England, the Commons assembled in parliament do hereby pray that the said Richard Mountague may be punished according to his demerits, in such exemplary manner as may deter others from attempting so presumptuously to disturb the peace of Church and State, and that the book aforesaid may be suppressed and burnt." *

Two conferences held on the subject.

The Commons did not at this time carry their persecution of Mountague very far, being diverted from their purpose by the pursuit of higher game. But there was a desire in the minds of certain members of both Houses to have some satisfaction given to them on points which appeared to them doubtful. Accordingly, on the 11th of February a conference, which had been procured by the Earl of Warwick, met at York House for deliberation.

* Rushworth, i. p. 207.

On the one side were the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Buckeridge), and Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle; on the other side the Bishop of Lichfield, Dr. Morton, and Dr. Preston, preacher at Lincoln's Inn. The Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Pembroke, together with many other nobles and persons of inferior quality, were present. Each of the five points alleged against Mountague was discussed; but the question on which there was the greatest argument was "whether it was possible for one elected to fall from grace." It is hardly necessary to say, that the result of the conference was inconclusive. A second meeting was held on the 17th of February,* at which a greater number of persons were present, when Mountague himself argued instead of Buckeridge. As is usual in party discussions, they again arrived at no satisfactory result, "the friends and fautors of each side giving the victory to those whose cause they favoured." †

The royal proclamation acquitting Mountague.

The controversy waxed warmer, and with a view to stopping it, the king issued a proclamation on June 14th, in which he acquitted his chaplain, and declared that he would support the Church of England. He enjoins the archbishops and bishops in their several dioceses speedily to reclaim and suppress all such preaching as should in the least degree tempt to violate the bond of peace.

Dissatisfaction of the Puritans.

The proclamation was carefully worded, and was valued by the king for its impartiality. But it is observed by Rushworth, that how equally soever intended, the effect of the proclamation became the stopping of the Puritans' mouths, while it granted an uncontrolled liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party.‡ The violence of the Puritans was so great that the government was inclined to interpose between the contending parties, and Burton and Prynne would have been prose-

* Laud's Diary. † Cyp. Ang., p. 140.
‡ Rushworth, i. p. 413.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

cuted except for the interference of Parliament. Burton and Prynne were, according to Heylyn, inflamed with a desire of revenge, and were ever ready to head a violent opposition to all persons whatsoever, who did not coincide with them, or who were not stimulated with the same outrageous zeal.*

Prosecution of Buckingham.

The noble quarry that diverted the attention of the parliament from the case of Mountague, was no less than the favourite himself, the Duke of Buckingham. The Commons took umbrage at the duke's conduct when the subject of the supplies created contention between the king and the parliament. The king was involved in a war with Spain, and desired to know upon what supplies he might reply. Without receiving the needful supplies, he could only prevent a mutiny in his army by recourse to measures from which he revolted as inconsistent with his royal dignity. The king's appeal, however, had little effect, and the Commons accused Buckingham of high crimes and misdemeanours. He was accused of incapacity in his office of admiral, of abusing the king's liberality, of selling places of importance, of squandering the revenues, of engrossing all the public offices, of preferring his own relations. His mother and his father-in-law were represented as patronising the Papists. The king stood manfully by his friend, and was fully aware that his chief offence was that he did not encourage the Calvinistic faction. In Laud's diary of the 22nd of April, being Sunday, he says: "The king sent for all the bishops to come to him at four o'clock in the afternoon. We waited upon him, fourteen in number. Then his majesty chid us that in this time of parliament we were silent in the cause of the Church, and did not make known to him what might be useful, or what was prejudicial to the

Accusations against the duke.

Timidity of the bishops.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 148.

Church; professing himself ready to promote the cause of the Church. He then commanded us, that in the causes of the Earl of Bristol and Duke of Buckingham, we should follow the direction of our own consciences, being led by proofs, not by reports."*

The Earl of Bristol's charge was, that the duke had endeavoured to convert the king, then Prince of Wales, when in Spain, to the Popish Church; but the Commons had found other grounds of accusation. Buckingham defended himself against the charges brought against him with modesty and great ability. But the king, wearied with the factious opposition, was specially moved by a letter written to him by an unknown person, which ended thus—"It behoves his majesty to uphold the duke against them (the factious party in the Commons), who, if he be but dis-courted, it will be the corner-stone on which the demolishing of the monarchy will be builded; for if they prevail with this, they have hatched a thousand other demands to pull the feathers of royalty; they will appoint him councillors, servants, alliances, limits of his expenses, accounts of his revenue; chiefly, if they can (as they mainly desire), they will now dazzle him in the beginning of his reign."†

Parliament dissolved.

The King finding, in short, that all his endeavours to arrange matters with the Commons were of no avail, dissolved parliament on the 16th of June, 1626.

The duke's speeches written by Laud.

These circumstances are noticed by the biographer of Laud, because his name was brought forward more or less in all the discussions. He was accused of being the duke's adviser and speech-maker. Prynne moreover asserted that the king's speech to the two Houses of Parliament was penned for him by this "pragmatical Bishop." These cannot be called heavy charges, and

* Diary, April 22, 1626. † Cyp. Ang., p. 145.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

His defence.

Laud's replies to them at a subsequent period, are simple. With regard to the duke's speech, he says: "If in that speech any particular fault had been found, impeaching any right or power of parliament, that I must have answered; but none is charged, but only the bare making of one speech, and the mending of another. And this is a very poor argument of any enmity against parliaments.* Secondly, seeing no fault is charged upon me in particular, it was but the office of a poor friend to a great one, to whom being bound so much as I was, I could not refuse so much service, being entreated to it. And, thirdly, I do humbly conceive, that so long as there was nothing done against law, any friend may privately assist another in his difficulties."† Of the king's speeches to this parliament, he wrote in his defence: "I might shuffle here, and deny the making of them; for no proof is offered, but that they are in my hand; and that is no necessary proof: for I had then many papers by me written in my own hand, which were not my making, though I transcribed them, as not thinking fit to trust them in other hands. But, secondly, I did make them, and I followed the instructions which were given me as close as I could to the very phrases: and being commanded to the service, I hope it shall not now be made my crime that I was trusted by my sovereign."

Resigns Ibstock.

Laud resigned, on the 6th of March, the parsonage of Ibstock, which he had held *in commendam*. He does not assign any reason for so doing, but his successor, Richard Bailey, married next month the bishop's niece;‡ and he probably resigned in his favour.

* Heylyn is evidently wrong in repudiating the idea that the speeches were written by Laud, either for the king or for the duke. Cyp. Ang., p. 145.

† Troubles and Trial, Laud's Works, vol. iv. p. 354.

‡ Rymer, Fœd., VIII. ii. p. 31. The register of the marriage is at Long Whatton. Diary, Mar. 6.

A certain Dutchman, at this time, by name John Oventrout, who was apparently a Calvinistic fanatic, proposed to show a way how the West Indies might shake off the yoke of Spain, and put themselves under the subjection of King Charles. The king desired the principal secretary to converse with the old man on the subject; and as religion was alleged to have somewhat to do with the proposal, Laud was desired to be present. "The old man proposed something about the taking of Arica," says Laud; "yet showed not to us any method, how it might be taken; unless it were, that he would have the minds of the inhabitants to be divided in the cause of religion, by sending in among them the Catechism of Heidelberg. We dismissed the man and returned not a whit the wiser." *

Oventrout the Dutchman.

Convocation was now sitting, and was involved in controversy. In a sermon preached before the king on the fifth Sunday in Lent, the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Goodman, spoke of the Real Presence in the Holy Communion. The sermon made a considerable sensation, because it touched a point on which the Puritans could not distinguish between Catholicism and Romanism. There were several proctors in convocation, who, if they did not actually hold the heretical notions of Puritanism, were nevertheless afraid of those who did. Disputes arising which led to no decision, the king appointed a committee consisting of Archbishop Abbot, and the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and St. David's, to consult together and to report to the king himself. They made their report on the 12th of April, and gave a judgment, in which Abbot, it must be observed, concurred, "that some things in that sermon had been spoken less warily, but nothing falsely; that nothing had

Convocation.

Goodman on the 'Real Presence.'

* Diary, Mar. 16, 1625-6.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

Goodman's vindication.

been innovated by Dr. Goodman in the doctrine of the Church of England. But howsoever, that they thought it very fit that Dr. Goodman should be appointed to preach again before his majesty, for the better explaining of his meaning, and showing how and in what particulars he had been mistaken by his auditors." This the bishop accordingly did, and thus the matter ended. The commission and the king dealt leniently with him, and he so explained himself as to escape penalty; but this same bishop afterwards proceeded to great extremes, until he made an open profession of Romanism.*

A.D. 1640. Refuses subscription to the canons of 1640.

In 1640, certain canons for the better government of the Church, which began to be disquieted by the proceedings of some factious men, were drawn up by convocation. They were seventeen in number, and were generally accepted. But to the first Bishop Goodman took exception, being startled about the proceedings against the Papists. "This canon," Laud says, "is very express for the use of all good and Christian means, to bring them out of their superstitious errors, and to settle them in the Church of England. And the morning before the subscription was to be, my Lord of Gloucester came over to Lambeth to me; and after great expressions of dislike, I gave him the best counsel I could, that he would keep himself out of that scandal, which his refusing to subscribe would bring both upon his person, his calling, and the Church of England, in these broken times especially. But I fell so short of prevailing with him, he told me plainly 'he would be torn with wild horses before he would subscribe that canon.'" † The next day, when all the members of convocation were assembled in King Henry VII.'s chapel to subscribe the canons; suffering themselves, according to the usual

* Cyp. Ang., p. 14€. Diary, April 12, 1626.

† Troubles and Trial, Laud's Works, vol. iv. p. 154.

custom, to be all concluded by the majority of votes, though some privately dissented from certain particulars, the Bishop of Gloucester entirely refused his subscription thereto. Laud having by this time become archbishop, was justly offended, and exclaimed: "My Lord of Gloucester, I admonish you to subscribe." Presently after he repeated, "I admonish you, for the second time, to subscribe;" and immediately after, "I admonish you a third time to subscribe." Dr. Goodman pleaded conscience, and refused. That Laud was unjustifiably precipitate in uttering these Moneos, no one can deny; and when he put the question to the bishops severally, whether they should at once proceed to the suspension of the Bishop of Gloucester he was mildly rebuked by the Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Davenant, who suggested that some considerable interval should have been allowed between the three admonitions, in order that time might be given for deliberation.

Some days after, Dr. Goodman was committed to the Gatehouse, where, as Fuller says, "he got by his restraint, what he would never have got by his liberty; namely of one reputed popish, to become for a short time popular, as the only confessor suffering for not subscribing the canons." * He was set at liberty afterwards, submitting himself to take the said oath.†

Becomes a Romanist.

The king had already had notice of Goodman's perversion, from some agents beyond the seas,‡ and was altogether dissatisfied with the bishop. He was perverted to popery by one William Hammer, as appears by a letter from Hammer to Sir W. Hamilton, then at Rome, who communicated the matter to the king. Within a year Goodman again conformed to the Church of England.§

Returns to the Church of England.

* Fuller, Book xi. sec. vii. par. 23.

† Laud's Works, iv. p. 152.

‡ Laud's Works, iii. p. 291.

§ Letter to Windebank. No. clix. Laud's Works, vol. vi. pt. 2, p. 539.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

To bring the history of Goodman before the reader, we have anticipated many events. We return to 1626, when Laud was still Bishop of St. David's. On the 4th of May, 1626, he mourned over the loss of Dr. Arthur Lake, Bishop of Bath and Wells, a prelate whose consistent piety won for him the respect of all who knew him.* To the See thus vacant Laud was nominated by the king on the 20th of June.

Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Between the time of his nomination and his actual translation, Laud, by the king's command, preached a sermon at Whitehall, on the occasion of a solemn fast, observed partly on account of the pestilence yet raging in many parts of the kingdom, partly on account of the danger of foreign enemies.† There was at this time a great panic about a threatened invasion. An extraordinary commission had been given to the lords lieutenants of the several counties to muster and array men; ships had been sent to the Elbe and to Denmark, to prevent supplies from thence to the Spaniards; and the fleet at Portsmouth was ready to put to sea under Lord Willoughby.‡ In the course of his sermon, which was on the text, "Arise, O God, plead or maintain Thine own cause; remember how the foolish man reproacheth or blasphemeth Thee daily," Laud remarked: "These times are the very concurse of fear and danger. The clouds have threatened from heaven, now many days together, to destroy a hopeful and plentiful harvest, 'in the day of possession,' as the prophet speaks. The 'pestilence,' as if it were angry that God had driven it out of 'this great city of the kingdom,' wastes and destroys far and near in other places of it. The 'sword' of a foreign enemy threatens to make way for itself. And if it enters it is worse than 'famine' and the 'pestilence.' The

Sermon at Whitehall.

* Fuller, Book xi. Sec. vi. par. 45. † Diary, July 5.

‡ Rushworth, i. p. 416.

prophet calls it a 'razor;' but such as is readier to cut the throat than shave the beard." * The king desired the publication of the sermon, which was certainly a learned and able discourse. In little more than a week after the royal mandate, a printed copy was placed in his majesty's hand. It is the fifth of Laud's printed sermons.

The congé d'élire, empowering the Dean and Chapter of Wells to elect Laud to the see of Bath and Wells, was signed by the king in July. In August he was elected; in September he swore homage to the king at Theobalds, who then restored him to the temporalities, from the death of his predecessor.†

Subsidies required by the king.

Laud was now much consulted by Buckingham and the king. Although they did not act without the advice of the lawyers, their proceedings, viewed by us in the nineteenth century, were certainly unconstitutional; but in the seventeenth century, though the right was acknowledged that the House of Commons was the only authority for the direct taxation of the people, it was assumed that money to meet the royal necessities might be raised by recourse to measures, some of them of questionable legality. The clergy, until the time of the Restoration, had been from time immemorial accustomed to tax themselves, and heavy subsidies were sought for by the king, and granted by the convocation.

By the Parliament which now refused to give him the necessary support, the king had been reduced to a difficult position. His uncle, the King of Denmark, having espoused the cause of the Elector Palatine, had now himself been brought by General Tilly to great straits. ‡

The appeal to the clergy rested thus on a powerful basis. Charles did not apply to his clergy without

* Works, i. p. 119.
† Diary, July 8. July 16. Aug. 16. Sept. 19, 1626.
‡ Diary, Sept. 14, 1626.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

having first made considerable sacrifice on his own part. He had pledged the crown plate and jewels, and sold property to the city of London to the amount of 120,000*l.*, and he now desired to raise upwards of 173,000*l.*

Instructions to the Convocation.

On Thursday evening, Sept. 14, he communicated to Laud through the Duke of Buckingham his royal desire, that he should draw up certain instructions to the clergy, described by Laud himself as partly political and partly ecclesiastical. The heads of the documents were delivered to Laud, and he was desired to have a draft of the instructions ready on the Saturday following. With his usual punctuality and readiness the Bishop of Bath and Wells, at the hour appointed, read the draft instructions to the Duke of Buckingham, and being brought by the duke into the royal presence, the king signified his approbation of the same. They were read by the duke on the following day before the Lords of the Privy Council, by whom they were also approved. Laud was now being mixed up with politics, and it may be expedient to lay the instructions before the reader, for they are valuable as showing the distinction imperceptibly arising between Church and State:

"We have observed that the Church and State are so nearly united and knit together, that though they may seem two bodies, yet, indeed, in some relation they may be accounted but as one, inasmuch as they both are made up of the same men, which are differenced only in relation to spiritual or civil ends. This weakness makes the Church call in the help of the State to succour and support her, whensoever she is pressed beyond her strength. And the same weakness makes the State call in for the service of the Church, both to teach that duty which her members know not, and to exhort them to, and encourage them in, that duty which they know. It is not long since we ordered the State to serve the Church, and by a timely proclamation settled the peace of it. And

now the State looks for the like assistance from the Church, that she and all her ministers may serve God and us, by preaching peace and unity at home, that it may be the better able to resist foreign force uniting and multiplying against it. And to the end that they to whom we have committed the government of the Church under us, may be better able to dispose of the present occasions, we have, with the advice of our council, thought fit to send unto you these instructions following, to be sent by you to the bishops of your province, and such others whom it may concern, and by them and all their officers be directed to all the ministers throughout the several dioceses, that according to these punctually they may instruct and exhort the people to serve God and us, and labour by their prayers to divert the dangers which hang over us. The danger in which we are at this time is great. It is increased by the late blow given our good uncle the King of Denmark, who is the chief person in those parts that opposed the spreading forces of Spain. If he cannot subsist, there is little or nothing left to hinder the House of Austria being the lord and master of Germany; and that is a large and mighty territory, and such as, should it be gotten, would make an open way for Spain to do what they pleased in all the west part of Christendom. For besides the great strength which Germany, once possessed, would bring to them, which are too strong already, you are to consider, first, how it enables them by land, in that it will join all or most part of the Spaniard's now distracted territories, and be a means for him safely and speedily to draw down forces against any other kingdom that shall stand in his way. Nor can it be thought that the Low Countries can hold out longer against him if he once become lord of the upper parts. And, secondly, you are to weigh how it will advantage him by sea, and

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

make him strong against us in our particular, which is of easy apprehension to all men. And besides, if he once get Germany he will be able, though he had no gold from India, to supply the necessity of those wars, and to hinder all trade and traffic of the greatest staple commodities of this kingdom, cloth and wool, and so make them of little or no value :

" You are to know, therefore, that to prevent this is the present care of the king and State, and there is no probable way left but by sending forces and supplies to the said King of Denmark, our dear uncle, to enable him to keep the field, that our enemies be not masters of all on the sudden. You are further to take notice, how both we and the whole State stand bound in honour and conscience to supply the present need of the king of Denmark. For this quarrel is more nearly ours, the recovery of the ancient inheritance of our dear sister and her children. Nor is the danger and dishonour all the mischief that is likely to follow this disaster. For if it be not presently relieved, the cause of religion is not only likely to suffer by it in some one part (as it hath already in a fearful manner in the Palatinate), but in all places where it hath got any footing, so that if we supply not presently our allies and confederates in this case, it is likely to prove the extirpation of true religion, and the replacing of Romish superstition in all the neighbouring parts of Christendom. And the coldness of this State shall suffer in all places as the betrayer of that religion elsewhere, which it professeth and honoureth at home, which will be an imputation never to be washed off. And God forbid this State should suffer under it.

" Neither may you forget rightly to inform the people committed to your charge, that this war, which now grows full of danger, was not entered upon rashly and without advice, but you are to acquaint them that all

former treaties by a peaceable way were in the latter end of our dear father of ever blessed memory dissolved as fruitless, and unfit to be longer held on foot; and this by the counsel of both Houses of Parliament then sitting; so those two great and honourable bodies of peers and people represented in parliament, led on this counsel and course to a war with Spain. To effect this, they desired our aid and assistance, and used us to work our said dear father to entertain this course. This upon their persuasions and promises of all assistance and supply, we readily undertook and effected, and cannot now be left in that business but with the sin and shame of all men. Sin, because aid and supply for the defence of the kingdom, and the like affairs of State, especially such as are advised and assumed by parliamentary council, are due to the king from his people, by all law, both of God and men; and shame, if they forsake the king, while he pursues their own counsel, just and honourable, and which could not under God but have been as successful, if it had been followed and supplied in time, as we desired and laboured for. One thing there is which proves a great hindrance of this State, and not continued among the people without great offence against God, detriment both to Church and State, and our great disservice in this and all other business. It is breach of unity, which is grown too great and common amongst all sorts of men. The danger of this goes far; for in all States it hath made way for enemies to enter. We have by all means endeavoured union, and require of you to preach it, and charity, the mother of it, frequently in the ears of the people. We know their loyal hearts, and therefore wonder the more what should cause distracted affections. If you call upon them (which is your duty), we doubt not but that God will bless them with that love to Himself, to His Church, and to their own preservation, which

CHAP. XXXIV. William Laud. 1633-45.

alone will be able to bind up the scatterings of divided affections into strength. To this end you are to lay before them what miseries home-divisions have brought upon this and many other kingdoms, and to exhort all men to embrace it in time. The danger itself, besides all Christian and prudent motives, is of force enough (where it is duly considered), to make men join in all amity against a common enemy, and to do it in time, before any secret and cunning working of his may use one part in a division to weaken the other.

"And in the last place (but first and last and all times to be insisted on), you are to call upon God yourselves, and to incite the people to join with you in humble and hearty prayers unto God, that He would be pleased now, after long affliction of His dear people and children, to look in mercy upon them and us, and in particular for the safety of the King of Denmark, and that army which is left him, that God would bless and prosper him against his and our enemies. Thus you are to strengthen the hearts and hopes of our loyal subjects and people, in and upon God. And whereas the greatest confidence men have in God, ariseth not only from his promises but from their experience likewise of His goodness; you must not fail often to recall to the memory of the people, with thankfulness, the late great experience we have had of His goodness towards us. For the three great and usual judgments which He darts down upon disobedient and unthankful people, are pestilence, famine, and the sword. The pestilence did never rage more in this kingdom than of late; and God was graciously pleased in mercy to hear the prayers which were made to Him, and the ceasing of the judgment was little less than a miracle. The famine threatened us this present year, and it must have followed had God rained down His anger a little longer on the fruits of the earth. But upon our prayers He stayed that

judgment, and sent us a blessed season and a most plentiful harvest. The sword is the thing which we are now to look to, and you must call the people to their prayers again against that enemy, that God will be pleased to send the like deliverance from this judgment also; that in the same mercy He will be pleased to strengthen the hands of His people; that He will sharpen their sword, but dull and turn the edge of that which is in our enemies' hands; and so while some fight, others may pray for the blessing. And you are to be careful that you fail not to direct and hearten our beloved people in this and all other necessary services, both of God, His Church, and us; that we may have the comfort of our people's service; the State, safety; the Church, religion; and the people, the enjoying of all such blessings as follow these. And we end with doubling this care upon you, and all under you in their several places."

No apology is necessary for presenting to the reader this document, in spite of its length. It may be regarded as Laud's first State paper, and it is of value as showing the state of affairs at the beginning of the reign of Charles I. A précis might have been more in accordance with the requirements of history, but this could hardly be given without a party bias.

That these instructions, when issued, should cause considerable ferment we can understand; but by the king, by Buckingham, by Laud, and by the Privy Council this was regarded as a conciliatory, because an explanatory document.

Of this measure we may observe, in justice to Laud, that it was not adopted at his suggestion or by his advice. We have no grounds for supposing that if his advice had been asked, in the first instance, he would have recommended a different course of proceeding; but as a matter of fact, Laud on this occasion acted a subordinate part;

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

he merely received certain instructions, and was to frame them in proper language for the adoption of the king.

Death of Bishop Andrewes.

Laud suffered at this period a severe loss by the death of the great Bishop Andrewes. Andrewes was his friend and adviser, and he spoke of him as the great light of the Christian world. Andrewes died Bishop of Winchester, on the 25th of September, 1626; and a greater, more learned, pious, munificent, and charitable prelate, according to the testimony of his contemporaries, never existed. It was a labour of love to Laud when, in conjunction with Bishop Buckeridge, he collected some of the sermons of Andrewes, and other pieces of his in English and Latin, which were published in two volumes, and dedicated to the king.* Andrewes had been dean of the Chapel Royal, and on Saturday, Sept. 30, Buckingham signified to Laud the king's intention that he should succeed the illustrious prelate. An evil custom prevailed in the Chapel Royal in the reign of King James, when the sovereign never attended the prayers, but thought only of the sermon. Whenever the king made his appearance, the anthem began and the preacher ascended the pulpit. Laud made an urgent appeal to King Charles, that he would on every Sunday be pleased to be present not only when the sermon was delivered, but especially when the prayers were offered; he further petitioned the king that at whatsoever part of the church service he entered the Chapel, the officiating priest might proceed without interruption to the close of the service. We are told, "that the most religious king not only assented to this request, but also gave thanks to his adviser." †

Laud, dean of the Chapel Royal.

Resistance to the loan.

With reference to the forced loan, as a means of raising money, a strong opposition was raised against it; and some, both of the nobles and of the inferior gentry, were, for their refusal to contribute, committed to prison. This

* Cyp. Ang., p. 157. † Diary, Nov. 4, 1626.

violent measure, intended to intimidate, only conduced to the exasperation of all classes of society. Among the most determined opponents, we may mention Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, who from the time of his disgrace at Court had become an opponent of his former friends, and a vehement patron of the puritans. Against the puritans or sectaries Williams had been at one period much provoked, but his impulsive nature led him to suppose that by involving the Court in difficulties, he would be called in to act as mediator and to reconcile differences.

Laud's difficulties became great; not only had he to contend against the manœuvres of Williams and against the puritans generally, with Archbishop Abbot at their head, but he had also to restrain such men as Sibthorpe and Manwaring who were approaching to Erastianism. This perhaps was his most difficult task at the present time. It seems scarcely possible to retain people in the "via media," and although there was much in the principles of Sibthorpe and Manwaring in which Laud would sympathise, it justly annoyed him to see them rushing to an extreme: he wished to shelter, though he could not defend them.

Sibthorp sermon.

At the assizes at Northampton, in February, Sibthorpe delivered a sermon in which he exaggerated and misrepresented the royal authority and prerogative; he asserted that if princes command anything which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either railing or reviling, and so to yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one.

Many passages more objectionable than this are to be found in the sermon. When Archbishop Abbot was required to license the sermon he refused to do so, and drew

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

up certain objections to the general tenor and the particular statements of the discourse. Laud stood bravely by the person who if he had not acted wisely, nevertheless deserved protection.* Sibthorpe altered the obnoxious passages and answered the objections. The sermon was then, by order of the king, considered in a committee, composed of the Bishops of Durham (Neile), Rochester (Buckeridge), Oxford (Howson), and Bath and Wells (Laud), who were to decide whether it was or was not fit to be printed. Because of his defect of hearing, the Bishop of London, Dr. Montaigne, was not troubled till all was ready, and then the sermon, with the objections and answers, was submitted to him.† He wrote in reply, "I have seen this sermon, and read over diligently the objections against it, and the answers to the objections, which I think do take away all scruples that may be made of these places now questioned, and therefore I think the sermon fit to be printed." It was presently published by the author under the title "Apostolical Obedience."

Manwaring's sermons.

The treatment of Dr. Manwaring was still more severe. He was chaplain to the king, and rector of St. Giles' in the Fields. He had preached two sermons before the king at Whitehall, in which his language was certainly as injudicious as it was incorrect. He affirmed, "that the king is not bound to preserve the subject in his legal rights and liberties; that his royal will and absolute command in imposing loans and taxes, though without the consent of parliament, ought to be obeyed by the subject, under the penalty of eternal damnation; that the authority of both Houses is not necessary for the raising aids and subsidies." ‡

He is impeached.

For the expression of these opinions Dr. Manwaring was impeached by the House of Commons. He was sen-

* Cyp. Ang., p. 159. † Laud's Letters, No. ccvi. Works, vol. vii. p. 7.
‡ Rushworth, i. p. 577.

tenced to be imprisoned, he was fined 1,000*l.*, he was suspended for five years, and he was disqualified for the enjoyment of any further preferment, or the discharge of any office in Church or State. Manwaring, as mean-spirited as he was rash, made submission at the bar of the House.*

Laud made responsible.

For the views expressed by these extreme and ignorant asserters of the royal authority and prerogative, Laud was held to be responsible, but if responsible at all, this was only partially the case. It was said that by licensing the publication of such a sermon as that of Sibthorpe, he endorsed the sentiments maintained, if not the arguments produced in their support. Let us hear Laud's own statement of the case.

His defence.

"The sermon being presented to his majesty, and the argument not common, he committed the care of printing it to Bishop Mountain (Montaigne), and four others, of which I was one. And this was the reason of the 'animadversions,' now called mine. As also of the answer to my predecessor's exceptions (now charged also), and called mine. But it was the joint answer of the committee. And so is also that other particular, 'in which the whole business is left to the learned in the laws.' For though the animadversions be in my hand, yet they were done at and by the committee, only *I being puny bishop*, was put to write them in my hand."† With regard to the subject of the sermon, Laud defended himself thus:—"'Tis said that I inserted into the sermon that the people may not refuse any tax that is not unjustly laid. I conceive nothing is justly laid in that kind, but according to law, God's and man's. And I dare not say the people may refuse anything so laid. For *jus Regis*, the right of a king, I never went further than the Scrip-

* Rushworth, i. p. 605.

† Troubles and Trial, iv. p. 276.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

tures lead me; nor did I ever think that *jus Regis*, mentioned 1 Sam. viii. 12, is meant of the ordinary and just right of kings, but of that power which such as Saul would be, would assume unto themselves, and make it right by power." *

With regard to Manwaring's sermons, Laud pointed out, in the same way, that it was not he, but Bishop Montaigne, who licensed them for the press. Moreover he was acquitted in open parliament, "to somebody's no small grief." "God forgive them," he says, "and their malice against me; for to my knowledge my ruin was then thirsted for." †

Manwaring was in 1635 consecrated Bishop of St. David's, and this was also made a charge against Laud, who assisted at the consecration. But it could not be expected that he should ruin himself, and fall into a *præmunire*, by refusing the king's royal assent to the preferment, from any fear lest it might be supposed that the preferment was procured by him. "The truth is," he says, "his majesty commanded me to put him in mind of him when preferments fell, and I did so; but withal I told his majesty of his (Manwaring's) censure, and that I feared ill construction would be made of it." ‡

Accompanies Buckingham to Cambridge.

The extreme unpopularity of Buckingham at this juncture may be fairly inferred from the fact, that the favourite of the king obtained his election to the chancellorship of Cambridge, by only a majority of three over Lord Andover. § But the splendour of his reception, when he visited the University to be installed, must have compensated in his mind for the coldness of the proceedings attending the election. The installation took place on the 3rd of March, when the duke was accompanied by

* Troubles and Trial, iv. p. 275.

† Ibid., p. 84. Manwaring was, in 1633, appointed Dean of Worcester.

‡ Ibid. § Birch's Court of Charles I., i. 107.

Laud. He entered the University in great state; and met, assembled to congratulate him, or to confer his new dignity upon him, a large assembly of earls and lords." He took his seat in the Congregation, and the first person presented to him for a degree was Laud himself, who had been incorporated a graduate of the University of Cambridge. The duke and the visitors were entertained by the University "in an academical manner, yet splendidly."

Laud did not remain long at Cambridge, being summoned to wait upon the king at Newmarket; whence they proceeded to London, where much important business was under debate, and Laud was frequently summoned into the royal presence.*

Accident to Laud.

Laud, who took no pleasure in field sports, and whose habits were those of a student, was as clumsy in action as he was ungainly in appearance. He was frequently meeting with accidents, and it had now happened that, when going to Court to wait upon the king at supper, his foot slipped as he was alighting from his coach, and he lay prostrate on the ground. The fall, however, was not dangerous, and with only a slight contusion, he escaped further injury.

Privy councillor.

On Sunday, April 29, Laud was sworn a privy councillor. It is evident that Buckingham was aware that his enemies at Court were numerous, and he was determined to have a friend who could explain to the facile mind of King Charles, the manœuvres resorted to by the enemies of the duke.

Laud himself had not only many enemies, but one in particular, whose power he might fairly dread. The queen knew how opposed he was to popery, and hated him with all the hatred of which the impassioned female mind is capable. At this juncture the king was as much

* Diary, March 6, 12, 13, 25. April 4, 7, &c. 1626–7.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

opposed to his wife as his wife was to Laud; but Laud was not ignorant of the fact that husband and wife, where love still existed between them, might easily be reconciled, and the friend and admirer of one might be regarded by each as the enemy of both. The levity and frivolity of the queen prevented this from being now the case, but her character at present was but partially known. The war with France was, indeed, to be traced to her bigotry or folly. She had come to England attended by a bevy of French priests, who scarcely concealed their aspiration to convert the English nation to popery. They alarmed the Commons, who, most of them, thought popery worse than Mahometanism; and their insolence to the English aristocracy converted into enemies many whose inclinations were originally favourable to their royal mistress. The king sided both with his people and with his courtiers; and in spite of the vehement protest of his queen, he commanded her priests, a few days before the dissolution of his second parliament, to quit the country.

The king of France had, under less provocation, acted in a similar way, when he dismissed the Spanish courtiers, who had accompanied the French queen to the Court of France. But he was now inflamed with anger. He laid an embargo upon all the merchant vessels at Bordeaux, and declared war against England.

Charles was thus obliged to employ against France, the army which was designed to oppose the Spaniards. The change in these arrangements necessarily occupied a considerable time, while the Rochellers were earnestly calling for aid. Michaelmas, 1626, had passed before the fleet could set sail for Rochelle, and it soon returned, having encountered a succession of violent storms. The calamity was remedied as soon as possible, and on the 27th of June 1627, another fleet and army was despatched, under the command of the Duke of Buckingham, for the Island

of Rhé. The forces were reviewed by the king at Portsmouth, to which place he had been attended by Laud.*

The result of the review was an inspiration of confidence and hope into the royal mind, and the king felt at liberty to attend to domestic concerns. He was much offended by the laxity of discipline, as exhibited by the Archbishop of Canterbury and by the Bishop of London (Dr. Montaigne), the first through disaffection, the second through indolence. The law was so neglected that any prelate who sought to enforce it was accused of innovating, whereas the real innovations arose from neglect. The strange and unjustifiable measure was adopted of confining Abbot to the administration of his diocese, while his metropolitical jurisdiction was sequestered and placed in commission.

Laud, Bishop of London.

As to London, the king determined to supplant the indolence of Montaigne by the energy of Laud; but the difficulty was to persuade Montaigne to resign. He was offered the bishopric of Durham, vacant by the translation of Dr. Neile to Winchester, but this seemed like a banishment to Montaigne, and the offer was refused. At length he was persuaded to accept the archbishopric of York; and on the 4th of July, 1628, Laud succeeded to the See of London.†

Despatches from Buckingham.

Laud was attending on the king and queen when, in July 1627, they were seeking the benefit of the chalybeate springs at Redwell. They were resting not from the duties of their office, but from the wretched contentions from which they were often unable to escape. The happiness of the Court, or at least of the king and of Laud, was increased by good news from the seat of war. Buckingham had been successful, and the English army, as usual, was distinguished for the valour of the troops. Twice in

* Cyp. Ang., p. 160. Diary, June 7.
† Cyp. Ang., p. 166. Fœdera, viii. p. 265.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

August similar despatches had arrived, and Buckingham's return to England as a hero was anticipated by his friends. But suddenly a blow came; and the more grievous because, from the preceding despatches, it had not been expected. The duke had failed, and the failure was attributed to bad generalship, or want of strategic skill. He had taken the Isle of Rhé, but he had not followed up his advantage, and had neglected to seize the chief fort when it almost lay at his mercy. The French, with forces far superior to his own, raised the siege. Buckingham should, under the circumstances, have retreated to his fleet. Instead of this, with forces far inferior to those of the French, he gave his enemies battle, which ended in a defeat. His valour as a soldier was unimpeachable, his skill as a general could scarcely be admitted.

While the enemies of Buckingham complained of his want of military skill, his friends laid the blame on the parliament by whom the supplies had been refused. There was much to be said on both sides, but after all was said that could be said, the fact remained, that he had suffered a defeat, and the nation feeling itself disgraced was indignant. It was the universal demand that a parliament should be forthwith summoned.

Parliament summoned.

Both Laud and Buckingham advised the calling of a parliament; but they were aware that it was more than doubtful what the course might be that parliament would pursue. The members of either House might receive Buckingham with applause as the person who had suggested to the king to defer to his parliament; or, on the other hand, parliament, when it had the power, might use that power to the overthrow of the favourite.

The latter course was adopted, and Buckingham was attacked for the failure of the late expedition. From his intimacy with Buckingham, Laud was involved in his disgrace. The very intimacy was charged upon him as

a crime by the puritans. When Laud mentioned to the king the falsehoods circulated against him, Charles replied, "Let me desire you not to trouble yourself with any reports, until you see me forsake my friends." *

Commissioner under the sequestration of Archbishop Abbot.

Between the return of Buckingham in November 1627, and the assembling of parliament in June 1628, Laud had been chiefly occupied as a member of the commission appointed for the discharge of the archiepiscopal functions, during the sequestration of Archbishop Abbot. The appointment of the commission was an act of tyranny, and Laud ought to have declined to serve on it. It brought its consequences with it, however, and Laud was severely punished.

Before the commissioners was brought the case of the Countess of Purbeck, who had committed adultery with Sir Richard Howard. The sentence of the court was delivered *ex officio*, as the representative of the archbishop by the Bishop of London.† The lady was confined to the Gatehouse, but by the aid of Sir Robert Howard, she made her escape. Laud acted only officially, and gave sentence according to the decree of the court; but long after, he was fined by parliament for false imprisonment, in the sum of 500*l*. He observes in his diary: "In such a case, say the punishment was more than the law allows, what may be done for honour and religion's sake. This was not a fine to the king, but damage to the party." ‡

An accident to Laud.

Laud met with an accident in February, which caused him considerable uneasiness and much pain. He was attending the king to Hampton Court, when his foot slipped, and the back sinew of his right leg was strained. The agony he suffered, and his thankfulness at being

* Cyp. Ang., 172.
† Birch's Court of King Charles, p. 296.
‡ Diary, Dec. 21, 1640.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

restored to health, is evident from the following prayer, given in his Private Devotions :—

"O Domine misericors, glorificetur beatissimum nomen Tuum : ecce enim ego, dum pro officio regem sequor, et Tui, et humanorum casuum immemor, et mihi præfidens, infausto in via saltu in terram infidam incidi, et tendonem fregi. Levatus in currum, Hamptoniam perveni. Cruciatus talis fuit, qualem versi sentire solent. Et certe in febrem ferventiorem ipse angor conjecisset, nisi ingens defluxus sanguinis me ab illo metu liberasset. Magna infirmitate laboravi, et fere per biennium claudus incessi. Infirmitatem aliquam adhuc sentio, sed, gratiæ immortales Tibi, O beatissima Trinitas, usum satis perfectum crurium dedisti mihi, et confirmasti, præter omnium exspectationem, gressus meos. Dirigas nunc eos, O Domine, in viis mandatorum Tuorum, ut nunquam vel inter Te et falsum cultum, vel inter Te et mundum claudicem ; sed recta pergam, et viam testimoniorum Tuorum curram, quum dilatasti cor meum. Oro itaque, ne differas vel dilatationem cordis, vel confirmationem pedum in semitis justificationum Tuarum, per et propter Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum." *

A strange dream.

Not long before this mischance, he was troubled as usual with dreams. Laud had been especially moved by one in which he imagined he was reconciled to the Church of Rome. He wondered, in his dream, how this should happen ; and was aggrieved not only with himself, by reason of the errors of that Church, but also upon account of the scandal which, from his fall, would be cast upon many learned and eminent men in the Church of England. The determination seemed to come upon him that he would immediately, confessing his fault, beg pardon of the Church of England. Going with this

* Works, iii. p. 82.

resolution, a certain priest met him in his dream, and would have stopped him; but moved with indignation, he went on his way; and while he was wearying himself with these troublesome thoughts, he awoke. But, as he adds in his description thereof, "I felt such strong impressions, that I could scarce believe it to be a dream."*

Laud was confined to his chamber after the accident till the opening of parliament, except that upon Thursday, St. Valentine's Day, he exerted himself to officiate at the baptism of George, the Duke of Buckingham's son,† at Wallingford House.

Heylyn's visit.

He was visited during his illness by his chaplain, Heylyn, and the following extract from the *Cyprianus Anglicus* is interesting as throwing light upon the inner life of Laud: "Coming," says Heylyn, "at the time appointed I heard of his mischance, and that he kept himself to his chamber; but order had been left amongst the servants, that if I came he should be made acquainted with it, which being done accordingly, I was brought into his chamber, where I found him sitting in a chair, with his lame leg resting on a pillow. Commanding that nobody should come to interrupt him till he called for them, he caused me to sit down by him, inquired first into the course of my studies, which he well approved of, exhorting me to hold myself in that moderate course in which he found me. He fell afterwards to discourse of some passage in Oxon, in which I was specially concerned, and told me thereupon the story of such oppositions as had been made against him in that University by Archbishop Abbot, and some others; encouraged me not to shrink, if I had already, or should hereafter find the like. I was with him thus, *remotis arbitris*, almost two hours. It

* Diary, March 8, 1626–7.

† Diary, Feb. 14, 1627. The Duke's first-born son had died the March before. This was the notorious Buckingham of Charles II.'s reign.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

grew towards twelve of the clock, and then he knocked for his servants to come unto him. He dined that day in his ordinary dining-room, which was the first time he had so done since his mishap. He caused me to tarry dinner with him, and used me with no small respect, which was much noted by some gentlemen who dined that day with him. A passage, I confess, not pertinent to my present story, but such as I have a good precedent for from Philip de Comenes, who telleth us as impertinently of the time (though he acquaint us not with the occasion) of his leaving the Duke of Burgundies service, to betake himself to the employments of King Lewis XI." *

Sermon at opening of parliament.

On March 17th, 1627-8, Charles' third parliament assembled, and the opening sermon was preached by Laud. Evidently foreseeing a stormy session, he chose for his text Ephes. iv. 3, "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The sermon is published in Laud's works, and is worthy of a perusal for its solid reasoning as well as for its eloquence. The conclusion of the exordium is ingenious:—"Saint Paul wrote this epistle to the church of Ephesus, not the city. And he called for 'unity bound up in peace' for the church's good, without any express mention either of city or state. Yet he well knew that the good both of the state and the city would follow upon it. For 'unity' is a binder up; and 'unity of spirit,' which is religious unity, is the fastest binder that is. And lest it should not bind fast enough, it calls in the 'bond of peace.' So that no man can exhort unto, and endeavour for the 'unity of the church,' but at the same time he labours for the good of the state. And if it were so at Ephesus, where the state was heathen, much more must it needs be where the state is Christian." The text is then divided

* Cyp. Ang., p. 166.

into six particulars, and in laying before his hearers the excellence and effects of unity, the preacher said, that "unity is a very charitable tie, but better known than loved. A thing so good, that it is never broken but by the worst men. Nay, so good it is, that the very worst men pretend best when they break it. It is so in the Church; never heretic yet rent her bowels, but he pretended that he raked them for truth. It is so in the State; seldom any unquiet spirit divides her union, but he pretends some great abuses, which his integrity would remedy. 'O that I were made a judge in the land, that every man, which hath any controversy might come to me, that I might do him justice.' (2 Sam. xv. 4.) And yet no worse than David was king, when this cunning was used. 'Unity' then, both in church and commonwealth, is so good, that none but the worst willingly break it; and even they are so far ashamed of the breach that they must seem holier than the rest, that they may be thought to have a just cause to break it."

"You see what 'unity' is? Will you see what hurt follows where it is broken? First, fraction makes uneven reckonings. And it is hard, very hard, for a man that breaks 'unity,' to give either God or man a good account of so doing. Hard to give an account; but that is not all." "For the Church; nothing saith Saint Chrysostom, doth so provoke God to anger, as to see *divisam Ecclesiam*. His Church purchased by one blood, to be one body, made more, made other, than one. And for the Commonwealth; a people is as one city, yet such a one, saith Saint Augustine, *cui est periculosa dissensio*, as to whom all breach of 'unity' is full of danger. For Church and State together; it was a grievous rent amongst the Jews, when 'Manasses devoured Ephraim, Ephraim Manasses, and both fell upon Judah.' What followed. Was God pleased with this, or were the

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

tribes in safety that were thus divided? No sure. For it follows; 'the wrath of the Lord was not turned away, but his hand was stretched out still.'

"I press 'unity' hard upon you—pardon me this zeal. O that my thoughts could speak that to you that they do to God; or that my tongue could express them but such as they are; or that there were an open passage that you might see them, as they pray faster than I can speak for 'unity.'

"One unity there is—take heed of it—it is a great enemy to the 'unity of the Spirit,' both in church and commonwealth. Saint Basil calls it *concors odium*, unity in hatred to persecute the Church. And to this work there is unity enough; men take counsel together. Saint Augustine calls it *unitatem contra unitatem*, a unity against unity. And about that work, 'that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance,' that there may be no church or no reformed church, 'Gebal and Ammon and Amalek, the Philistines and they that dwell at Tyre, are confederates together.' Saint Hilary will not vouchsafe to call such union 'unity;' indeed it deserves not the name; it is not unity, saith he, be it in the Church or be it in State; but it is a combination. And he gives this reason; for unity is in faith and obedience; but combination is *consortium factionis*, no other, no better, the consenting in a faction. And all faction is a fraction too, and an enemy to 'unity;' even while it continues in one. For while it combines but a part, it destroys the unity of the whole.

"And now I cannot but wonder what words St. Paul, were he now alive, would use to call back 'unity,' into dismembered Christendom. For my part death were easier to me, than it is to see and consider the face of the Church of Christ, scratched and torn, till it bleeds in every part, as it doth this day; and the 'coat of Christ,' which

was once spared by soldiers, because it was seamless, rent every way, and, which is the misery of it, by the hand of the priests; and the pope, which Bellarmine hath put into the definition of the Church, that there might be one ministerial head, to keep all in unity, is as great as any, if not the greatest, cause of divided Christianity. Good God! what preposterous thrift is this in men, to sew up every small rent in their own coat, and not care what rents they not only suffer, but make in the 'coat of Christ.' What is it? Is Christ only thought fit to wear a torn garment? or can we think that the 'spirit of unity,' which is one with Christ, will not depart to seek warmer clothing? Or if he be not gone already, why is there not 'unity,' which is wherever He is? Or if He be but yet gone from other parts of Christendom, in any case, for the passion, and in the bowels of Jesus Christ, I beg it, make stay of Him here in our parts."

Laud ended this very able and pertinent sermon in these words. "I began with St. Paul's exhortation; I end with his prayer and benediction. It is the prayer of the day, for it is the second lesson at evening service. 'The God of Peace give you peace always, and by all means;' peace in concord, and peace in charity; peace on earth and peace in heaven; peace of grace and peace in glory. To all which, Christ for His infinite mercies' sake, bring us all."*

King's speech.

The king, in the speech with which he opened the session, exhorted the members of the parliament to give heed to the advice addressed to them from the pulpit, and to maintain the unity of Spirit in the bond of peace. He then urged the Commons to grant him that supply, for

* Sermon, No. vi. Laud made two allusions in this sermon to his accident; speaking of the breaking a sinew. "It is σύνδεσμος, the very word which the Apostle uses, the band, or the sinew of peace," &c. pp. 170, 177.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the procurement of which the parliament had been especially summoned.

We must, at the same time, admit, that Charles had not evinced any readiness, on his own part, to make any personal sacrifice to effect the end he had in view; and the Commons were not prepared to yield to the king, until the king had shown that he would yield to his people that freedom and those privileges which they had a right to demand or maintain. They justly regarded a forced loan as illegal; the very words 'forced loan' being a misapplication of terms. No fewer than seventy-eight gentlemen had been imprisoned for refusing to pay a tax forced upon them in the shape of a loan to the king,—a loan of which no repayment was promised or intended. These men were now restored to liberty. Anything more mean-spirited than the conduct of the government we can hardly conceive. If they had not been guilty of an offence when they were committed to prison, their imprisonment was an act of injustice: if they had committed an offence, their liberation at this time was an act of cowardice. They were hailed by the people as persecuted patriots, and most of them obtained seats in the new parliament.

The question now was—who should yield? Should the king yield a portion of what he regarded his prerogative, or should the parliament yield the liberties of the people. The king's first object was to obtain, through subsidies voted by parliament, the means of upholding the honour of himself and his country by assisting the Rochellers; and overcoming his reluctance, he confirmed the bill before parliament, which became an act, that neither he nor his privy council should have power to imprison anyone without showing cause; and that no tax, loan, or benevolence should be levied by the king or his ministers except by act of parliament.

This royal concession was hailed by the people with enthusiasm; and parliament signified their gratitude by a grant of the subsidies.

Religious bigotry.

Both in the demerit of refusing the concession, and in the merit of yielding to the just demands of the people, Laud must bear his share, for though Buckingham advised the Crown, he first consulted Laud.

But while we rejoice in every step taken towards the establishment of our liberties, of which this act may be considered the basis, we are obliged to turn from the patriots to the puritans; and if the patriots were fighting for the freedom of the people, the puritans were equally violent for enslaving the mind. Nothing but the most narrow-minded Calvinism was to be tolerated. If the Revolution, which had now begun, had been left to the patriots, things might have been brought to a peaceful termination. But among them, while there were several men of powerful minds, there was none of pre-eminent genius and firmness of purpose, except Oliver Cromwell, and he,—until towards the close of his life,—was himself a puritan, and found it difficult to extricate himself from the domination of that party, when he perceived that they must be controlled by a master mind, and recognised the existence of that master mind in himself.

Some of the leading patriots, disgusted by the puritans, left the puritanical party, and attached themselves with more or less of sincerity or of confidence to the Court. Of this number were Falkland, Wentworth, Hyde, and others. They hoped to win from Charles by way of concession what the Commons perverted into a disloyal demand. It is to be remembered that several of these patriots were personal friends of Laud, as were especially Wentworth and Hyde. No one would suspect Pym and his traitorous mistress, the Countess of Carlisle, of puritanism; but they were among those who, taking a course

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

opposite to that adopted by the statesmen just mentioned, were ready to combine with the puritans in their most fanatical proceedings in order that they might secure a majority in parliament against the Court. Men of that class first co-operated with the puritans; they admitted that they had, in point of religion, little in common; but they added, "We cannot do without them." Constant intercourse and co-operation had their usual effect, and many who at first were lukewarm, were at length overwhelmed with the fiery fanaticism by which even charity was annihilated and destroyed.

The puritans themselves had some reason in their madness. They desired to obtain support in the House of Lords; and the first religious measure brought forward was one in which the great majority of the Lords would concur. They moved the Lords to join them in a petition to the king for the suppression of popery, which they regarded as the "wall of separation" between them and their God.* The plan was well devised, though based on premises which had not been established. They suspected that the king, advised by Laud, was in heart a papist, and they were taken by surprise when the king expressed his readiness to satisfy them in their petition.

Prosecution of Mountague.

The Commons professing to be well pleased with the answer, voted the supplies. But the disposition of the House of Commons was soon made known by their prosecution of Dr. Mountague. It is not for us to defend the sermon of Mountague, which was as certainly injudicious as it was undoubtedly not heretical; but the fact must be noticed in a history of Laud, because it was the evident intention, through Mountague, to stab the Bishop of London. An attempt was made to implicate Laud in the matter of these sermons, but it failed. He says:

* Lingard says: "These men, so eager in the pursuit of civil, were the fiercest enemies of religious freedom."

"After his (Mountague's) censure my cause was called to the report, and by God's goodness towards me I was fully cleared in the House."*

Laud has been accused by those who take the puritan historians for their authority, of introducing "innovations" into the Church. But no one, perhaps, would have more zealously denied the truth of such a charge, and modern innovators will certainly not find an exemplar in him. The real innovators had been the puritans in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth. Certain laws were laid down for the regulation of Divine service, and the jurisdiction of the Church. These regulations had been very generally set aside by the puritans, who introduced foreign and Calvinistic forms. These were the innovators. What Laud did was simply to insist, that the law both in Church and State should be strictly observed. I say nothing of his manner of enforcing the law, but I advert merely to his principle. What is the law? Tell me that; I will see that it is obeyed. This was his principle.

Laud not an innovator.

But as an innovator, and as one who designed to introduce popery clandestinely into the country, the puritans accused Laud to the king. In their address of thanks to the king for granting the Petition of Right, they broadly stated their suspicions and alarm at the favour shown to recusants; and as both the king and Laud asserted their attachment to the English Church, and their condemnation of the errors of popery, they passed to a charge (evidently designed against Laud), of Arminianism, against those who had not yet seceded to the Romish Church. The king's good subjects, it was said, were perplexed by the daily growth and spreading of the Arminian faction. This his majesty well knew was but a covert practice for the bringing in of popery; that all who professed Arminian opinions were no better than incendiaries, and common nuisances

Accused o Arminianism.

* Diary, June 14, 1628.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

both in Church and State. They complained that, notwithstanding his majesty's public dislike of those persons, they were advanced to posts of honour and trust, and, to give instances, the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Neile, and the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Laud. The latter prelate was suspected of unsound opinions in this direction; that hence, it was said, Arminianism being looked upon as the most thriving persuasion, and the road to preferment, many scholars were tempted to declare themselves of that party; that books maintaining Arminian tenets were easily licensed, while difficulties were thrown in the way of their opponents.

Arminianism described.

This charge of Arminianism was so often repeated, that it may be expedient to remind the reader of what were the real opinions of those men who, like Laud, were represented as the enemies of God and man. The tenets of the Arminians are stated with conciseness and accuracy by Le Bas. An Arminian was one who rejected the doctrine which affirms that men are doomed to eternal happiness or misery by an arbitrary and irrevocable decree, and that the grace of God is so absolutely indefectible, that the elect can never fall away; one who believes that the divine scheme of redemption was in its design universal; one who believes that the human will is not in a state of perfect slavery; one also who did not hold it altogether damnable to hold some doubts whether the Church of Rome was prefigured by the Scarlet Woman in the Apocalypse; one who moreover did not consider it impossible that a member of the Romish Church might be saved.

It appears strange that they who hold these notions—or rather these Scriptural doctrines—should be thought, even to the present time, to be the illiberal party in theological controversy.

In the Remonstrance complaint was made of the pro-

gress of popery in Ireland; and, at the suggestion probably of the patriots, who had troubled themselves little about Arminianism and recusancy, certain well-founded charges were brought against the government for the mismanagement of public affairs, which included a reference to the power of the Duke of Buckingham, and of its abuse.

The king's answer to the Remonstrance.

The king, disappointed and angry, returned an inconsiderate reply. "On his answer to the Petition of Right, he expected no such declaration from them, which containeth divers points of State touching the Church and the Commonwealth. That he did believe that he understood them better than themselves. But since the reading thereof he perceived that they understood these things less than he imagined; but notwithstanding he would take them into such consideration as they deserved."*

It will be seen how far behind the age the mind of the king still remained. The great Queen Elizabeth might treat the House of Commons as if they were ignorant schoolboys; but the times were changed, and there was neither a Henry nor an Elizabeth on the throne. The Commons, if they were not amused at the puerility of the king's reply, gave proof at once that they would not act on his advice.

Laud appointed to answer the Remonstrance.

We must here briefly advert to State affairs, because Laud received the royal command to prepare a reply to the Remonstrance,—a labour, under the circumstances, of the greatest difficulty, the difficulty becoming the greater by the persistence of the king in the unwise course which we have seen him adopt.

The session had, indeed, in our view of the subject, been a memorable one. It obtained a recognition of the rights of the people against the king on several important points, and fixed our liberties on a firm and permanent

* Bibl. Reg., Sect. 157, No. 3.

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

basis. The patriots, many of them, showed a disposition to support the king in his just prerogatives, if he would support them in maintaining their rights, but doubts were beginning already to be entertained of the king's sincerity; and although the Court succeeded in attaching some of the leading patriots to its cause, still suspicion kept either party, except in a few well-known instances, apart.

Tonnage and poundage.

The question of tonnage and poundage had come before the parliament. The Commons contended that, by the Petition of Right, the king was precluded from levying duties on merchandise, without the consent of parliament first obtained.

Puritan intolerance.

This demand of the parliament occupied the mind of the king so completely, that he took less umbrage than we should have expected at the proceedings of the puritan members of the House of Commons. They required that all compositions for recusancy should be at once abolished; moreover, so one-sided was their love of liberty, and so much did they thirst for the blood of papists, that they desired that priests returning from banishment might at once be put to death. To these demands Charles returned a conciliatory answer. He affirmed that in granting at any time indulgence to the Romanists, he had trusted that foreign princes would extend a similar indulgence to Protestant subjects.*

While trying to conciliate a party which was not to be reconciled to the existing state of things, Charles gave increased offence to those who were still capable of hearing reason, and of being won to the court.

An address was about to be presented to the king in regard to the question of tonnage and poundage, upon the principle of which we have already spoken. Charles forestalled the framers of the address, drawn up, but not formally presented. He appeared in the House of Lords,

* Journals, Lords, 713, 714. Rushw. i. 519.

and being seated on his throne, required the attendance of the Commons. He proceeded to explain away all that he had hitherto been supposed to concede. "Both Houses," he said, "professed they meant not to intrude on my prerogative. Therefore it must needs be conceived that I have granted no new, but only confirmed the ancient liberties of my subjects. Yet I do not repent nor recede from anything I have promised; and I hereby declare that those things whereby men had cause to suspect the liberty of the subject to be touched upon, shall not hereafter be drawn into example for your prejudice. But as for tonnage and poundage, it is a thing I cannot want and was never intended by you to ask, and never meant, I am sure, by me to grant."*

The difficulties which Laud had now to encounter were great; nevertheless, in obedience to the royal command, he very soon prepared an answer to the Remonstrance of parliament. As the work of Laud it may be proper to present it to the reader, observing only that the preamble and conclusion are alone omitted; it reveals his own principles, and those of the political party he now represented

Answer to the Remonstrance.

And first (he remarks) that Remonstrance begins at religion, and fears of innovation in it; innovation by popery; but we would have our subjects of all sorts to call to mind what difficulties and dangers we endured not many years since for religion's sake. That we are the same still, and our holy religion is as precious to us as it is or can be to any of them, and we will no more admit innovation therein, than they that think they have done well in fearing it so much. It is true, that all effects expected have not followed upon the petitions delivered at Oxon, but we are in least fault for that; for supply being not afforded us, disenabled us to execute

* Journals, Lords, 879. Commons, June 25, 26. Rushw. i. p. 631.

all that was desired, and caused the stay of those legal proceedings which have helped to swell up this Remonstrance. Yet let all the counties of England be examined, and London, with the suburbs thereof, neither is there such a noted increase of papists, nor such cause of fear as is made; nor hath any amounted to such an odious tolerating, as is charged upon it, nor near any such. For that commission so much complained of, both the matter and intent of it are utterly mistaken; for it doth not dispense with any penalty, or any course to be taken with any papists for the exercise of their religion, no nor with the pecuniary mulcts or non conformity to ours; it was advised for the increase of our profits, and the returning of that into our purse, which abuse or connivancy of inferior ministers might perhaps divert another way; if that or any other shall be abused in the execution, we will be ready to punish upon any just complaint. The next fear is the daily growth and spreading of the Arminian faction, called a cunning way to bring in popery; but we hold this charge as great a wrong, to ourself and government, as the former; for our people must not be taught by a parliament remonstrance, or any other way, that we are so ignorant of truth, or so careless of the profession of it, that any opinion, or faction, or whatever it be called, should thrust itself so far and so fast into our kingdom without our knowledge of it; this is a mere dream of them that wake, and would make our loyal and loving people think we sleep the while. In this charge there is great wrong done to two eminent prelates that attend our person; for they are accused, without producing any the least show or shadow of proof against them; and should they, or any other, attempt innovation of religion, either by that open or any cunning way, we should quickly take other order with them, and not stay for your remonstrance.

To keep on this, our people are made to believe, that there is a restraint of books orthodoxal; but we are sure since the late parliament began, some whom the Remonstrance calls orthodox, have assumed unto themselves an unsufferable liberty in printing. Our proclamation commanded a restraint on both sides, till the passions of men might subside and calm; and had this been obeyed as it ought we had not now been tossed in this tempest. And for the distressing and discountenancing of good preachers, we know there is none, if they be (as they are called) good. But our people shall never want that spiritual comfort which is due unto them; and for the preferments which we bestow, we have so made it our great care to give them, as reward of desert and pains; but as the preferments are ours, so will we be judge of the desert ourselves, and not be taught by a Remonstrance. For Ireland, we think in case of religion, it is not worse than Queen Elizabeth left it; and for other affairs, it is as good as we found it, nay, perhaps better; and we take it as a great disparagement to our government that it should be voiced, that new monasteries, nunneries, and other superstitious houses are erected and replenished in Dublin and other great towns of that our kingdom. For we assure ourself, our deputy and council there will not suffer God and our government so to be dishonoured, but we should have some account of it from them; and we may not endure to have our good people thus misled with shows. There is likewise somewhat considerable in the time when these practices to undermine true religion in our kingdoms are set on foot. The Remonstrance tells us it is now, when religion is opposed by open force in all parts. But we must tell our people, there is no undermining practice at home against it, if they practise not against it that seem most to labour for it; for while religion seems to be contended for in such a

CHAP. XXXIV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

factious way, which cannot be God's way, the heat of that doth often melt away the purity which it labours earnestly (but, perhaps, not wisely), to preserve. And for God's judgments, which we and our people have felt, and have cause to fear, we shall prevent them best by a true religious remonstrance of the amendment of our lives, &c.*

Laud's translation to London.

On Tuesday, July 1st, 1628, the congé d'élire for the election of Laud to the bishopric of London was signed by the king.† The election and other official transactions occupied a fortnight. One of the first official acts of the new bishop was the consecration, on the 24th of August, of Dr. Mountague to the see of Chichester‡ At the confirmation of bishops in the Court of Arches, at Bow Church, in Cheapside, there had been, according to custom, public notice, that if any persons could object either against the party elected or the legality of the election, they were to offer their exceptions on the day appointed. Consequently, two days before the consecration, one Jones, a bookseller, accompanied by a mob, attended at Bow Church, and made exception to Dr. Mountague, as a papist and an upholder of heterodox opinions; but the exceptions were not given in writing, nor were they signed by an advocate, nor presented by any proctor of the court; they were therefore disallowed by the representative of the vicar-general, presiding in the court. Mountague was therefore confirmed in his bishopric.

Death of the Duke of Buckingham.

In the midst of the solemnity of the consecration, the news arrived at Croydon, where the service was held, of

* Cyp. Ang., p. 172. Rushworth, ii. p. 1.

† Diary. The congé d'élire, however, was dated July 4. Rymer, Fœd. vii. ii. p. 265.

‡ The other consecrating bishops were, besides the Archbishop, the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Neile), the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Buckeridge), and the Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. White).

the death of the Duke of Buckingham. We need not repeat the story of his murder, which forms an era in English history. We only remind the reader that it took place at Portsmouth on the 23rd of August, 1628. The duke having determined to give a practical refutation of the charges brought against him, had left London on the 12th of August, to place himself at the head of the expedition to Rochelle. He had, indeed, given such satisfaction to the Rochellers in his former campaign, that they solicited the English king to renew the command to Buckingham. The duke had, nevertheless, many melancholy forebodings with respect to the future; he felt deeply his unpopularity, which he thought to be undeserved, and regarded certain prophecies with an amount of superstitious dread which was characteristic of the age. He showed that apprehension of danger is not inconsistent with physical courage. The proud duke humbly besought William Laud, if his life should be forfeited in fighting for his country, to recommend to the king's special protection and care his poor wife and children. When Laud inquired whether he had any special ground for his melancholy, or if he suspected the existence of a plot against his life, the duke simply answered that he might like any other man be killed.

His spirits, however, were raised soon after he had arrived at Portsmouth; and fortune seemed at first to smile on him. News arrived that Rochelle had relieved itself. It was early in the morning, and his grace gave orders that his breakfast might speedily be made ready, as he wished to convey the news himself to his royal master, who was staying at Southwick, about five miles distant, the house of Sir Daniel Norton.

The death of Buckingham by the hand of an assassin, John Felton, was no part of a plot. It is certain, at all events, that this unhappy man was not an agent in the

hands of the puritans; but it is not less certain that the puritans spread abroad reports damaging to the duke's character, and numerous pasquinades. These as usual have been copied without examination by modern historians, and Buckingham's character has been handed down to the reprobation of posterity. His faults were many, but on a principle before laid down, we ought not to depreciate his many virtues. We ought not to forget what is said of him by such men as Sir Henry Wotton and by Lord Clarendon, his contemporaries, according to whom he was "of an excellent nature, and of a character very capable of advice and counsel." *

To Laud the loss of Buckingham was irreparable. As was usual with him, he repaired for consolation to the "Father of mercies and the God of all comfort." The prayer he composed and used on the occasion of Buckingham's murder is as follows:—

"O merciful God, thy judgments are often secret, always just. At this time they were temporally bearing upon the poor Duke of Buckingham, upon me, upon all that had the honour to be near him. Lord, thou hast, I doubt not, given him rest, and light, and blessedness in Thee. Give also, I beseech Thee, comfort to his lady, bless his children, uphold his friends, forget not his servants. Lay open the bottom of all that irreligious and graceless plot that spilt his blood. Bless and preserve the king from danger, and from security, in these dangerous times. And for myself, O Lord, though the sorrows of my heart are enlarged, in that Thou gavest this most honourable friend into my bosom, and hast taken him again from me, yet blessed be Thy name, O Lord, Thou hast given me patience. I shall now see him no more till we meet at the resurrection. O make that

* Wotton's Reliquiæ, p. 114. Clarendon, i. p. 55.

joyful to us, and all Thy faithful servants, even for Jesus Christ His sake."

Charles's favour to Laud.

The Bishop of London was consoled by the kindness of the king. Three days before he met the corpse of the duke, on its way from Portsmouth to London, a gracious message from his majesty was conveyed to him by one of the royal household, Mr. Elphinstone. And on the day of the funeral Sir William Fleetwood presented his lordship with some gracious letters, written by the king's own hand.

Desiring to remain for a short time in retirement, a desire shared by the king, the Bishop of London was not summoned to Court till the month of September. He was graciously received by Charles, who signified his intention of reposing that confidence in him which he had formerly rendered to their common friend the duke.

## CHAPTER XXXV.

### WILLIAM LAUD A STATESMAN.

Laud as a Statesman.—The Caroline divines.—State of matters at Oxford.—Reform in the election of Proctors.—Reform of the University statutes.—Laud Chancellor of Oxford.—His benefactions to his College and the University.—The royal declaration appended to the Thirty-nine Articles.—Petition of the puritans.—The case of the Feoffees.—Measures of conciliation.—Attitude of the House of Commons.—Attacks upon Laud.—His illness.—He devises measures for correcting abuses in the Church.—Royal instructions.—Controversial preaching forbidden.—Bishop Davenant's troubles.—Itinerant lecturers suppressed.—Violent preaching at Oxford.—The many projects of Laud.—Restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral.—Controversies at Oxford.—Proceedings in the Star Chamber.—The case of Leighton.—And of Prynne.—Changes in the Bishoprics.—The painted window at Salisbury.—The foreign chaplaincies.—Royal visit to Scotland.—Death of Archbishop Abbot.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Constitution of England.

By the death of Buckingham, a great change took place in the social position and the history of Laud. The King determined to make him his adviser, counsellor, and friend. Henceforth Laud is to be regarded in his character as a statesman. The general opinion is that Laud represented a party in the Church, and that for upholding his party he was ready to make almost any sacrifice. Such was certainly not the case. Laud's object was plain and simple; it was to enforce the law, as the law then existed, whether in civil affairs or in ecclesiastical. What does the law require was his question: to enforce what the law required was his determination. He was *homo unius sententiæ*. We may condemn him certainly as a most unwise minister, as one wanting in the sagacity to perceive that a modi-

fication of the existing constitution was required by the exigencies of the age in which he lived; but although he may thus be justly exposed to censure by politicians, we ought not to forget that the office of sole minister of the Crown had been thrust upon him; and that he thought that he was acting as a conservative patriot, when he stood opposed to those who in effecting innovations in Church and State, are in these days justly regarded as laying the foundations of English liberty. Laud felt it to be his duty to preserve the constitution as he found it. He did not deny that it required reform, but thought that all reform should emanate from the throne. He regarded all attempts at reform from without, as an indication of insubordination, if not an act of treason. Why should he be wiser than James I.? James, enraged by the legal independence of Sir Edward Coke, declared it to be treason to affirm that the king was *under* the law. We may credit Laud with greater wisdom than this; but he subscribed to the dictum of Bracton, "Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo et Lege."* A large margin is here implied; and the whole controversy, during the early part of Charles's reign, was involved in the sense in which the affirmation was to be understood.

Living as we do under the blessings of a constitution which, through a variety of revolutions, some open and avowed, and some conducted by a succession of scarcely perceptible events, has become a model to foreign nations when struggling for their freedom, it is very difficult to place ourselves, in our imaginations, in the position of a statesman of the seventeenth century. While among the statesmen there were some who considered the monarchical government, in itself, a grievance, there were others who, acting as conservatives, determined to contend for

* 12 Coke, 63.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the royal prerogative, and to support the royal power to the last. Instead of making generous concessions to the wishes of the people, and anticipating their desires, this party only yielded to outward pressure. By first resisting and then complying they were continually inviting further opposition; they saw the weakness of the Crown, and began to suspect the sincerity of the king. The Kings of Spain and of France were despotic, and Charles thought it reflected disgrace upon the King of England if he were less powerful than they. His patriotism led him to place England on the same footing as foreign countries, while his people thought first of establishing their own rights.

Laud as a statesman.

While we censure Laud for a want of foresight and of forethought, as a statesman—and a statesman's education he had not received—justice ought to be done to his administration. He accepted the constitution as he found it. He regarded the will of the king to be law, except when it was limited by Magna Charta, or by acts of parliament. He regarded the acts of parliament merely as concessions made from time to time by the Crown. The parliament was looked upon as a council to be consulted, but not to legislate; to grant subsidies, but not to control their expenditure. No one can read the history of Henry VIII. and of Queen Elizabeth, without seeing that their notion of parliament was little removed from that of a great squire in regard to a parish vestry. The vestry was to vote the rate, and then to submit to the great man's commands. Until the reign of Charles I. the notion of parliament was that it was an institution to tax the subject; and not to suggest measures, but to consider what the Crown might offer for discussion or debate. To volunteer an address on the part of parliament was, in the time of the Tudors, resented by the sovereign as an insult. Even in the matter of raising money, although it

was admitted that direct taxation depended upon the will of parliament, there were other means of raising money which, though more than questionable, and after a time denounced by the patriots, were at first regarded as legitimate.

Ample justice is done to the short reign of Oliver Cromwell, for the prosperity to which he, in a brief space of time, raised the country; let equal justice be done to Laud. His success, before the triumph of faction, was brilliant. Commerce was extended, and the foundation was laid of that commercial aristocracy for which the north of England is still celebrated. Fresh land was brought under cultivation, and, through an increase of rent, yeomen had grown into gentlemen. The abodes of nobles vied in splendour with the palaces of ancient kings. "Invested," says M. Guizot, "as to civil affairs, with a less extended and less concentrated authority than that of Strafford in Ireland, and less able than his friend, Laud did not fail to pursue the same (reforming) line of conduct. As Commissioner of the Treasury, he not only repressed all pilferings and illegitimate expenditure, but applied himself to the thorough understanding of the various branches of the public revenue, and to the finding out by what means its collection could be rendered less onerous to the subject. Vexatious impediments, grave abuses, had been introduced into the administration of the customs duties, for the profit of private interests. Laud listened to the complaints and representations of merchants; employed his leisure in conversing with them; informed himself by degrees as to the general interests of commerce, and freed it from trammels which had materially injured it, without any advantage to the exchequer. In March, 1636, the office of High Treasurer was given, on his recommendation, to Juxon, Bishop of London, a laborious, moderate-minded man,

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

who put an end to numberless disorders which had alike been injurious to the Crown and to the citizens. To serve, as he fancied, the king and the Church, Laud was capable of oppressing the people, of giving the most iniquitous advice: but where neither king nor Church was in question, he aimed at good, at truth, and upheld them without fear as to himself; without the slightest consideration for other interests."*

The statesmen who surrounded Charles might fairly contrast the prosperous state of England with the ruin and bloodshed of the Continent. Anyone might be excused for being incredulous, if it were stated that beneath the pastures of peace and plenty a volcano was about to burst, which would render England,—though ultimately restored to prosperity—for a long season, a bye-word among the nations, for misery, crime, and civil war.

Church affairs.

In Church matters, Strafford, co-operating with Laud, had compelled Ireland to bend to the sovereign will, and to conform to the Church. Even Scotland, the future source of the miseries of the country, at first seemed calm, and the king and Laud, warned by the vacillations of James and Abbot, thought that only time and firmness of purpose were wanted to make the three kingdoms obedient to the Church. That firmness which had enabled Laud to work a reformation in the cathedral church of Gloucester; that energy by which he had removed or abated so many abuses in his first diocese of St. David's, characterised also his action as Bishop of London, and Archbishop of Canterbury. When primate, he received reports every year from the bishops of his province, and they were, generally speaking, of a satisfactory character. The ecclesiastical fabrics were restored, and the bishops, if too eager to increase their revenues, nevertheless ex-

His work for the Church.

* Guizot's History of English Revolution, p. 40.

pended their money in a meritorious manner on the restitution of the Church. He encouraged in every way those in whom he perceived ability and energy, if their abilities and energies were used for and not against the Church; and those who had for a time transgressed the law, found, on their return to their duty, that Laud was placable. We still look to the Caroline divines as the great authority for English theology, as distinguished from popery on the one side, and puritanism on the other; and it ought not to be forgotten by an impartial observer of the history of those times, that most of these divines were brought forward and encouraged, if not rewarded, by Laud. He, on his part, had received the greatest assistance and benefit from one whom he regarded as his model in ecclesiastical matters—his beloved friend, the great Bishop Andrewes; and he was anxious to encourage others as he himself had been encouraged. The genius of Jeremy Taylor he early discovered, and to bring him into closer contact with himself, he forced him into a fellowship of All Souls. Jeremy Taylor had been educated at Cambridge, and, it was alleged, was too young for the fellowship according to the statutes. Amongst others who were annoyed at the appointment was Dr. Sheldon, afterwards archbishop, a man like-minded with Laud, but who could not tolerate what he considered an abuse. By some writers this nomination to the fellowship is regarded as an illegal and oppressive act; but it may be doubted whether Laud deserves the blame to which he has been exposed. The statutes of the college were certainly set at nought, but the fellowship had been resigned into Laud's hands, and he only followed the custom of the day, when he assumed that he had a right to dispose of a piece of patronage thus placed at his option. We have seen Laud showing his deference to college statutes, by refusing to hold in commendam the presidentship of St. John's; and it

His encouragement of others.

Jeremy Taylor.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

seems most probable that he misunderstood the law in this instance. How this may have been we have already shown. But it is no business of ours to defend Laud. Our present object is simply to remark on the patronage which he extended to one of our greatest divines, at an early period of his life, when his genius and his virtue were sufficiently apparent to the few who knew him, although his immortal works had not yet seen the light.

Bishop Hall.

Bishop Hall, who at first was opposed to Laud, and had not feared openly to rebuke him, gave no offence to a primate who admired his sincerity as well as his learning; and Bishop Hall not only became the friend of Laud, but submitted his powerful work on Episcopacy to his correction before he gave it to the public.

Sanderson.

It was by Laud that Sanderson was recommended to the king, who, having made him his chaplain, was heard to say, "I carry my ears to hear other preachers, but my conscience to hear Mr. Sanderson."

Bishop Bedel, Archbishop Bramhall, Peter Heylyn.

Bishop Bedel, Archbishop Bramhall, Peter Heylyn, and others too numerous to mention, were all more or less indebted to the protection and patronage of Laud. When, however, we speak of the Church of this age, we are not to confine our view to persons occupying prominent places in the Church; but if we go to the facts of history, we shall find examples of parochial industry, if equalled, never surpassed. Take for instance George Herbert. Could his works have the sale they still command, if there were not country clergymen aiming at the same perfection as that which, to urge him onwards, he had placed before himself? In his last illness he would not have been visited by the dean and prebendaries of the neighbouring cathedral of Salisbury, if they had not appreciated his merits. They visited him with affection, and he received them the more readily, for he felt grateful to them for their admirable management of the cathedral, in the ser-

George Herbert.

vices of which he found, when in health, his great delight. From the parish priest and the poet, we may pass on to one of the greatest divines that the Church of England has produced. In Dr. Hammond we find the very model of a country pastor, the more remarkable from the fact that, when at Oxford, he was, among the great divines of that university, "facile princeps."

Dr. Hammond.

We are deeply interested in the measures adopted by Nicolas Farrar, and the brotherhood he established; and we must not forget that Nicolas Farrar was ordained by Laud, and through Laud's influence, visited by King Charles I. The patronage of Laud, when he was archbishop, was extended towards the whole of that devout family.

His reforms and benefactions at Oxford.

While Laud supported and encouraged these learned and zealous men, he was noble in his benefactions to, and labours for, the seat of learning where he himself had received his education. Oxford always held a high place in his affections. Besides his contribution of MSS. in almost every language to the library, he endowed a professorship of Arabic, and annexed a canonry to the professorship of Hebrew, now held by one of the most learned, devoted, and pious divines of the nineteenth century. He sought to stimulate the study of rhetoric by giving another canonry to the public oratorship. He procured for the universities the privilege of printing Bibles, hitherto a monopoly of the king's printers. He reformed the press at Oxford, and set up a Greek press in London.

Election of proctors.

There had been for some time annual disturbances at the election of the proctors. There was a combination of certain houses to procure the appointment of their nominees; while the weaker party summoned to their aid non-resident graduates to vote in their behalf. A great disturbance was anticipated in 1628, and Laud persuaded

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the chancellor to enforce certain decrees or statutes, altogether nullifying the votes of non-residents. These, however, did not produce the expected effect. The king himself interposed. He addressed a letter to the chancellor, to be forwarded to the vice-chancellor and proctors. In this letter his majesty expressed his astonishment that in "such a body of schollers there could be found such strange and violent humours;" and he desired that all possible and speedy measures should be taken to calm the tempest. The disturbances still, however, continued. Underhand dealings were resorted to, and even blows were exchanged by learned members of the convocation.* So great was the rivalry and bitterness, that the vice-chancellor dissolved the convocation, and refused to call another. The king in consequence appointed a commission, of which Laud was a member, to report upon the case, and to nominate the proctors. The determined conduct on the part of the authorities terminated the controversy for the present; but to prevent similar tumults and factions, Laud proposed that for the future the proctors should be chosen by their several colleges, each college having more or fewer turns, according to the number and greatness of its foundations. The statutes to this effect were passed without a dissentient voice, and are still in force.†

University reform.

His attention having been called to the subject, Laud determined to effect a complete reformation of the university, and when afterwards he was invested with full powers as the chancellor of the university, he published those statutes by which his object was effected. The time had certainly arrived when reform

* Taylor (the junior proctor), and Thomas Mottershed, of Christ Church, were committed to the Fleet for such offences by the Commissioners. Wood, Ann. Ox., ii. p. 363.

† Wood, Ann. Ox., ii. p. 364, &c.

had become a necessity. "Their statutes," said Laud, "lay in a miserable confused heap; when any difficulty arose, they knew not where to look for remedy or direction. When in the convocation-house a new statute was enacted, this many times proved contrary to an old one concerning the same business. Men in the mean time were sworn to both, which could not possibly be kept together. By this means perjury was in a manner unavoidable; and themselves confess in their register, that till this was done, they did in a sort swear that they might be forsworn." * Many attempts had before been made to obviate this confusion, but without success. It was even said by some of the governors of the body, that if a remedy were not applied in time, there would be "scarce any face left of an university." Laud caused the contradictory statutes of the university to be collected and arranged in order. For this end certain delegates were appointed; but so great was the work they had undertaken, and so many were the difficulties against which they had to contend, that it was not till 1636 that the new statutes were finished, when they were published in convocation.† These praiseworthy efforts, made at a time when he was overwhelmed with business, were actually brought up against Laud as an offence, when his enemies thought to prove him a traitor in all that he said or did. It was alleged against him that he used undue influence to obtain for himself the high honour of the chancellorship of the university. To this allegation he answered, that not only was it untrue as regarded himself, but also that he was much interested in promoting the appointment of another. In fact it seems evident that, notwithstanding the growth of Calvinism both in the uni-

* Troubles and Trial, Works, iv. p. 187.

† Wood, Ann. Ox., A.D. 1629–36. Diary, Jan. 22, 1636. Hist. of Chancellorship, Works, v. pp. 124 et seq., &c.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

versity and in the country generally, Laud was highly esteemed at Oxford, and many who differed from him even in matters of doctrine, were inclined to respect his abilities, and to uphold him against the nominees of the Calvinistic party for the chancellorship.

Chancellor of the university.

When, on the 10th of April, 1630, the death of William Earl of Pembroke, chancellor of the university, was made known at Oxford, the deceased earl's younger brother, Philip, Earl of Montgomery, was put forward at once as a candidate for the vacant honour. The friends, however, of the Bishop of London, Dr. Laud, and especially the members of his own college, St. John's, determined that he was the better man, and more fitted for the place, if the office were to be more than honorary. Nevertheless, the Calvinistic party was strong, and was active for the earl. The Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Williams, who had considerable influence, being visitor of Balliol, Oriel, Lincoln, and Brasenose Colleges, interested himself against Laud, and sent letters and agents in the earl's behalf. But he laboured in vain. In convocation the members who voted for the Bishop of London were declared to be the more numerous, and, the "scrutiny for voices" being finished, Laud was pronounced by the senior proctor to be duly elected chancellor of the university of Oxford.

The result of the election was not satisfactory, of course, to the Calvinians, and they would not accept their defeat. They insisted that the greater number of voices had been really with the earl; that the election had been conducted unfairly; and that to obtain his appointment Laud had himself resorted to indirect means.*

Laud's benefactions to

Leaving the question of the lawfulness or fairness of Laud's election, the writer of the Annals of Oxford says,

* It need hardly be said that Prynne was one of the foremost in making these unworthy accusations. Cant. Doome, p. 71.

"Certain it is, it fell out very happy, not only for the encouragement of learning, but the great good of the university, as the following times made it manifest. Had he continued in his prosperity seven years longer, and not been molested by the restless faction of the presbyterians, he would, without doubt, have made this university more famous for buildings, books, rarities, discipline, privileges, &c., than many put together in the learned world." *

A deputation from the university having waited upon the Bishop of London to inform him of his election, he presently addressed himself to the king, and received from his majesty this gracious answer: "that he knew none more worthy of it than himself; and that he should rather study how to add further honours to him, than take any from him." Laud, thereupon, appointed a day for the solemnity of his investiture in his office, which was performed in a full convocation held at London House.† Amongst other benefactions to the university, Laud had procured, through the instrumentality of the Earl of Pembroke, the late chancellor, and given to the public library, 240 Greek manuscripts; and from Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador from King James to the Great Mogul, he had obtained, and presented, 28 other Greek manuscripts; from Sir Kenelm Digby, he obtained a number of papers and books; and in 1635 he presented to the university a considerable number of valuable manuscripts, in Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Russian, Armenian, Chinese, Greek, Italian, French, English, Latin, and Swedish; for which he received the hearty thanks of the learned members.‡

While thus regarding the interests of the university

* Wood, Ann. Ox., ii. p. 364.
† Diary, April 28, 1630. Cyp. Ang., p. 197.
‡ Wood, Ann. Ox., p. 398.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

generally,* Laud took an especial delight in the enlargement and improvement of his own particular college. Calling to his aid the genius of Inigo Jones, from the designs of that eminent architect he added, at his own expense, a new quadrangle to the ancient buildings. The first stone of this great work was laid by Laud in 1631, and in the course of four years the new buildings were completed. To the old library he made an addition of twenty feet, and appended to it another occupying the east side of the lesser quadrangle; this he intended for manuscripts, of the greater number of which he was himself the donor. Here he caused to be deposited also all smaller books which might otherwise be in danger of being lost, any rarity which might afterwards be given, and other monuments of greater price.†

Whatever his business, however much occupied in the affairs of state, of his diocese, and afterwards of his province, Laud always remembered his university, and his college, and both by his exertions, and by his benefactions, he proved himself first a munificent president, and afterwards a most generous chancellor.

Neither did he neglect the discipline of the university. Almost immediately after his appointment to the chancellorship, he, being well aware of the existence of certain abuses, addressed the following letter to the vice-chancellor, Dr. Frewen:

Letter to Dr. Frewen.

"After my hearty commendations, &c. Your Deputy, Dr. Tolson, hath done very well in some business in your absence, which I hope you will perfect. Now I have a little more business for you, in which I must desire you to have a special care. I am given to understand, that formalities (which are in a sort the outward and visible face of

* Hist. of Chancellorship. Laud's Works, vol. v. p. 142. Wood's Hist. of Colleges and Halls, pp. 547, 548.

† Wood, *ut sup.*

the university) are in a manner utterly decayed, not only abroad in the streets, but also in the very schools, convocation, and congregation-houses, and at Latin sermons: insomuch that strangers, which come thither, have scarce any external mark by which they may know they are in a university. If this go on, the university will lose ground every day, both at home and abroad; and especially with his majesty, who is a great lover of order and decency in all seminaries of good learning. And he hath already given me strict charge to look both to this and other particulars in their several times. I pray, therefore, call the heads of colleges and halls, together with the proctors, and read these letters to them; and with my love remembered to them all, let them know I am welcomed into my chancellorship with many complaints from very great men. I hope all are not true: and I hope such as are, you and they will all, in your several houses, join pains and hearty endeavours to see them rectified, as I shall in due time severally propose them.

"At this time I think it necessary the heads should fairly bespeak their several companies to fit themselves with formalities fitting their degrees, that when the Act comes (God bless you with health, that it may hold with honour and safety), the university may have credit by looking like itself; and then I doubt not but it will be itself too. For it will not endure but to be as it seems. And I desire you would bespeak your companies fairly. Both because I presume, most men there, in their generous and liberal education, will be such lovers of order that they will run to the practice: and because I heartily desire that as I am chosen chancellor with a great deal of unexpected love, so I may be enabled ever to govern with a like measure of it. My heart ever was, and I hope ever shall be, set to do that place all the good I can. And I shall take it for one of God's greatest temporal blessings

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

upon me, if I may have your joint concurrence to perfect the good I wish. And I will not doubt, but that you do so love and honour that our venerable mother, that you will cheerfully afford me this assistance.

"When you have made this entrance for formalities at the Act (for which I now give time and warning), then, the better to settle them and all other points of government, I pray take care to go on with the delegacy for the statutes, that there may be a settled and a known body of them. My ever-honoured predecessor began that work with care. I know you will give me leave to pursue it to your good and honour. In the next long vacation, it were happy if that body of statutes might be finished.

"But whether it can or not, I heartily pray you, against Michaelmas term, look the register, and provide such tables as were wont to be published upon St. Mary's doors, for observance of the known statutes, and that then you proceed to the execution of them accordingly.

"I know you and the governors there will pardon me this care, when you shall know what lies upon me here, and what begins already to be expected from me by a most gracious prince, who is very zealous of the honour of that place. And this yet I shall promise and perform. I will not be sudden upon you, nor hasty with you in any your businesses. Neither will I proceed in anything but that which shall promote the honour and good of yourselves and that famous university. And in this way, he that gives me best assistance shall be most welcome to me. So for this time I take my leave, commending you all to God's gracious protection."

Republication of the Thirty-nine Articles, with the royal declaration.

His position as Bishop of London enabled Laud to see the evils by which the Church was surrounded; and as adviser of the sovereign, he suggested certain remedies. Fuller observes that, in preaching the abstruse and mystical doctrines of predestination and election, many both lost

themselves, and bewildered their hearers. No other subjects, however, were so frequently chosen for dissertation and discourse as these; and sermons abounded in vague theories and vain doctrine, which the promulgators fondly christened by the name "gospel." The best expedient for laying the predestinarian dispute to sleep, seemed to Laud to be to cause the Thirty-nine Articles to be reprinted, with a declaration by the king at the head of them; for by the statutes of the realm all incumbents were obliged to read the Book of the Articles at church, soon after their institution; and by the canons all that took orders were bound to subscribe them.

The declaration begins thus: "Being, by God's ordinance, according to our just title, 'Defender of the Faith,' and Supreme Governor of the Church within these our dominions, we hold it most agreeable to our kingly office and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge in the unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, alterations, and questions to be raised which may nourish faction both in Church and commonwealth. We have therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following: that the Articles of the Church of England (which had been allowed and authorized heretofore, and which our clergy generally have subscribed unto,) do contain the true doctrines of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word: which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles."

It is then stated, that if differences should arise about the external policy of the Church of England concerning injunctions, canons, or other constitutions, the bishops

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

and clergy in convocation should settle them; and, for that end, would have licence under the Broad Seal to deliberate upon, and do all such things, as might concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England established. As there had been both curious and unhappy differences, which for many hundred years had exercised the Church of Christ, it was now desired that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes be shut up in God's promises, as they are generally set forth in Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England, according to the Scriptures.

"No man," the declaration concludes, "shall hereafter either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense. If any public reader in either of our universities, or any head or master of a college, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any public disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the universities or colleges respectively; or if any divine in universities shall preach or print anything either way, other than is established in convocation, with our royal assent: he or they, the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure in our commission ecclesiastical, as well as any other: and he will see there shall be due execution upon them." *

Dislike of puritans to the declaration.

This declaration was loudly denounced by the Calvinian party; who asserted, that it was issued for the purpose of precluding godly ministers from preaching the com-

* Bibliotheca Regia, sect. 3, num. 4.

fortable doctrines of man's election to eternal happiness, or damnation. They declared the royal object to be the promotion of Arminianism. A letter, though evidently forged, was widely circulated by the impassioned credulity of the fanatics; it purported to be the production of the Rector of the Jesuits' College at Brussels, and it affirmed that the "sovereign drug" of Arminianism had been planted, and would soon purge off the Protestant heresy.

Petition of the Calvinists.

The Calvinists presented a petition to the king, in which they set forth "that a restraint was laid upon them from preaching the saving doctrines of God's free grace in election and predestination; that this had brought them under a very uncomfortable dilemma, either of falling under the divine displeasure, if they did not execute their commission in declaring the whole counsel of God, or of being censured for opposition to his majesty's authority, in case they preached the received doctrines of the Church, and attacked the Pelagian and Arminian heresies, both boldly published from pulpit and press."

It is sufficiently evident that the Calvinists were not aggrieved so much at the publication of the Articles, as at the enforcement of discipline implied in the declaration. They required that their ministers should be allowed to preach what they liked, however contrary their effusions might be to the doctrine of the Church of England, while they should, nevertheless, be recognised and received as true members of that Church. They professed liberality, and would not have those restrained who inflamed their passions by personal attacks, and vituperations, uttered from the pulpit. They were, at the same time, intolerant of all who adhered to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. All, in short, who refused to pander to their Geneva proclivities, they would consign to utter condemnation in this

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

world and the next. The petition against the declaration did not move the king; but the sense and substance of it was afterwards brought under the consideration of parliament, and was approved.

The difficulties against which Laud had to contend were, indeed, many and great. The puritan faction had, to a considerable extent, their own way during the primacy of Abbot. The fanatics were both numerous and powerful; hence, to restore church affairs to their proper level, was to Laud a task of no ordinary difficulty, and involved him in an amount of unpopularity which was ever on the increase. But he did not flinch from what he believed to be his duty. Having endeavoured to restrain the propagation of erroneous doctrine by the declaration with regard to the Articles, he proceeded to check a combination which had been formed under the pretext of aiding the regular and established clergy in their preaching; but really with the object in view of setting up a new body of lecturers in convenient places, for the promoting of the *cause*.*

The case of the "feoffees."

For this end certain feoffees had been legally settled in trust to purchase impropriations, and with the profit arising therefrom to set up and maintain a preaching ministry, in places where Calvinistic preachers were most required. These feoffees were not incorporated by the king's letters patent, nor by any act of parliament, but the success of the scheme was great. Of nine thousand two hundred and eighty-four parish churches endowed with glebe and tithes, nearly four thousand were either appropriated to bishops, cathedrals, and colleges, or impropriated (as lay fees) to private persons, as formerly belonging to abbeys. It was the object of the feoffees to redeem and obtain the latter, and in a short time large sums of money were at their disposal. A small

* Heylyn, 'The Appeal,' pt. iii. p. 13.

body of men, of whom it is observed by Fuller, "There were four divines to persuade men's consciences, four lawyers to draw all conveyances, and four citizens who commanded with coffers, wanting nothing save (which since doth all things) some swordsmen to defend all the rest,"* were thus enabled, by establishing puritan lectureships, to exercise an undue influence over the Church, and this under such specious pretence, that "both discreet and devout men were doleful at the ruin of so pious a project, not suspecting the danger nor foreseeing the mischiefs which must have followed if not crushed in time."†

Upon investigation, Bishop Laud found that the incumbents of the parishes from which the impropriate tithes were respectively taken, derived little or no benefit from the fund of patronage accumulated by this corporation of feoffees, or purchasers; that the lecturers, who were *hired*, not *endowed*, by that body, were persons notoriously disaffected to the discipline, if not the doctrine of the Church of England; that the preachers were left entirely at the mercy of their patrons, and were consequently under the necessity of suiting their doctrine to the taste of their employers; that a considerable portion of the fund was assigned to schoolmasters, and to students at the university; that another part was destined, not only to the support of silenced ministers, but of their wives and children after their decease; and that all this power was assumed by men who had formed themselves into a society without any legal authority or sanction. The conclusion from all these premises, as expressed by Laud himself, was no other than this,—that the whole scheme was a crafty device, under a glorious pretence, for the overthrow of the Church government, by placing a large portion of the clergy under a self-constituted body, in a state of dependence much more absolute than could be imposed by the

* Fuller, Book xi. sect. 7, 5. † Heylyn's 'Appeal,' ix. 16, 22.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

king, the peers, and the hierarchy together. Under this conviction, the Bishop of London never rested till the whole affair was submitted to the notice of Noye, the attorney-general; and by him brought before the Court of Exchequer. By the judgment of that court, the feoffment was overthrown in February 1633, and the impropriations bought by the feoffees were confiscated to the Crown. The criminal part of the charge against them was referred to the Star Chamber, but was never prosecuted further. Laud, as we gather from his diary and letters, was not actuated in these measures by hostility to the puritans, but by a real desire to place the Church of England in its proper position. Nevertheless, measures being necessary to prevent the extremes of the Calvinians, everything that Laud did to check extravagances in the opposite direction, was regarded with suspicion, and as a "sop to soothe" their bitterness.

Measures of conciliation.

Suppression of Mountague's and Manwaring's works

Mountague's book, "Appello Cæsarem," and Manwaring's Sermons, which, if not erroneous, were certainly not wise, were called in and suppressed by proclamation. This, according to the puritan historian, was considered as only "a feint to cover a more deadly blow to be reached at the puritans."

Proclamation against papists.

Against popish recusants a proclamation was issued, and directions were sent to his majesty's commissioners for taking the forfeitures of two-thirds of their estates. But this was regarded by the adverse party, not as prompted by zeal against the Romanists, but in order that the royal coffers, empty as usual, might to that extent be replenished. A similar assertion, however, could not be made of a second proclamation, which commanded that "all priests and Jesuits should be apprehended, and committed to gaol without bail or mainprize;" and offered a reward for the apprehension of Richard Smith, who called himself Bishop of Chalcedon. This "Romish priest" had been sent over by the pope to exercise episcopal jurisdic-

tion, and to be superintendent of the priests in the English dominions; he had appeared "*in pontificalibus*" in Lancashire, he had conferred holy orders, and performed other sacerdotal acts. He was not, however, cordially received by the regulars in England, and was doubtless glad when the royal proclamation rendered his position no longer tenable; he retired to France, and to the friendship of Cardinal Richelieu.*

Promotion of Dr. Potter, and restoration to favour of Abbot.

Dr. Potter, the Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, was promoted to the bishopric of Carlisle, which had become vacant by the translation of Dr. White to Norwich; and as he was well known as a "thorough-paced" Calvinian, it might be supposed that his party would be gratified. Archbishop Abbot was also restored to his liberty and jurisdiction. He was sent for to Court, kissed the king's hand, and was ordered not to fail to be at the council-board twice a week. After this he enjoyed the privilege of his station as long as he lived.

While thus a policy of conciliation was, to a certain extent, carried out with regard to the puritan faction, it cannot be denied that there was a weakness displayed in these measures which we should hardly have expected of Laud. The concessions were either insufficient, or else permitted the object in view to be so transparent as to provoke the ridicule as well as the anger of the leading members of the House of Commons. The movement was represented as one of the tricks of kingcraft, and, in fact, the passions of the leaders of the Commons being aroused, whatever the king did was regarded by them with suspicion. So true is the statement of Tacitus, "inviso semel principe, ceu bene facta, ceu male facta, premunt."

* Fuller xi. sect. 7, 7. Rushworth ii. p. 15. Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani, by Berrington, pp. 108–119. Smith died Mar. 8, 1655. Wood's Athen., ii. 187.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

In the parliament all other matters were postponed for what the puritans regarded as the religious grievance; and very violent speeches were made. Francis Rouse, afterwards Provost of Eton and Speaker of the House of Commons, said, amongst other things, that "Arminianism is an error that makes the grace of God *lackey* it after the will of man; that makes the sheep to keep the shepherd; and makes a mortal seed of an immortal God." "An Arminian is the spawn of a papist. You shall see an Arminian reaching out his hand to a papist, a papist to a Jesuit; the Jesuit gives one hand to the pope, another to the King of Spain; and these men have kindled a fire in our neighbour's country; now they have brought over some of it hither, to set on flame this kingdom also; they prepare to deprive us of our religion." Others, amongst whom was the celebrated Pym, who was no puritan at heart, followed suit; and Sir John Eliot, not satisfied with the general abuse of Arminianism, proceeded to attack Laud and Neile. "We see that there are some among our bishops who are not orthodox," he said, "nor sound in religion as they should be: witness the two bishops complained of at the last meeting of parliament. I apprehend much fear, that, should we be in their power, we may be in danger to have our religion overthrown." He proceeds to speak against ceremonies, but not against all. "Some ceremonies are useful. I hold it necessary and commendable that at the repetition of the Creed we should stand up to testify the resolution of our hearts, that we will defend the religion which we profess."

The "religious grievance" brought forward in parliament.

"Vow" of the Commons.

After some further debate a resolution or protestation was passed, called by Rushworth "the *vow* of the House of Commons," to this effect:—"We, the Commons in parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion which were established by parliament in the thirteenth year of our

late queen, Elizabeth, which by the public act of the Church of England, and by the general and current expositions of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others, wherein they differ from us." *

Though the Commons thus decided upon controverted points of religion, and settled what was orthodox and what was not, and quoted in favour of puritanism a statute † which was intended to provide against nonconformity, they were not yet satisfied. Again and again were the names of Laud, Neile, Manwaring, Sibthorpe, Cosens, and Mountague brought forward; and they were accused of preaching "flat popery." ‡ The violence of the members of this parliament led to no result. It was dissolved in the March following, leaving no acts completed behind it. § The personal attacks which had been made upon Laud were borne by him very patiently. "The parliament," he writes, "which was broken up this day, laboured my ruin; but, God be ever blessed for it, found nothing against me." ‖

Laud's patience under attack.

Of the bitterness of his opponents another proof was presently given. Two papers were found one Sunday in Lent, in the yard before the house of the Dean of St. Paul's, one of which contained a threat against the Bishop of London. "Laud," it ran, "look to thyself: be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of all wickedness, repent thee of thy monstrous sins before thou be taken out of the world, &c. And assure thyself, neither God nor the world can endure such a vile counsellor to live, or such a whisperer;" or to this effect. The other paper was equally violent against the Lord Treasurer, and

* Rushworth, i. pp. 649, 650. † 13 Eliz., cap. 12.

‡ This accusation was made by Oliver Cromwell, who was on the Committee of Religion. Rushworth, i. p. 655.

§ Fuller, Book xi. 6, 71. ‖ Diary, Mar. 10, 1628–9.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

both were delivered by the dean to the king that same evening. "Lord, I am a grievous sinner," writes the bishop, "but I beseech thee deliver my soul from them that hate me without a cause." *

These, and similar attacks, probably made a greater impression upon Laud's mind than he would acknowledge even to himself, and his health suffered in consequence. He was able to carry on his business with his usual energy for the greater part of the year 1629; and at this time he christened the first-born child of the king, being called upon to do so in the place of the archbishop, who was considered too infirm. The child did not survive his birth long, and on Ascension Day Laud buried him at Westminster Abbey. On this occasion he condescended, in his private papers, to a pun. "If God repair not this loss," he wrote, "I much fear it was *de*-scension day to this State." But in August he broke down, and was seized with a burning fever. He was staying at the time in the house of his old and trusty friend, Mr. Windebank.

Illness of Laud.

By this fever he was brought very low, and was not able to be removed to his own house till nearly the end of October. He was confined to his chamber for some time afterwards. But though he was incapacitated from active work, his mind was energetic as usual. He engaged himself in devising measures for the removal of certain abuses prevailing in the Church. There were bishops who cared more for bettering their own condition than for the good of their dioceses and the advantage of the Church. Some there were who, to the neglect of their episcopal duties, lived in the neighbourhood of Westminster, anxious to bring their merits under the notice of the Court. There were many itinerant lecturers, professing to be churchmen, although their sole object appeared to be to preach

Plan for the removal of certain abuses.

* Diary, March 29, 1629.

not only against the doctrines of the Church, but also against the government of the country. There were chaplains appointed by almost every gentleman, to serve in their private houses, subversive of all parochial discipline and ecclesiastical order. There were, in short, many evils to be remedied, and to supply a remedy for which, Laud was determined, although he must have been well aware that by his determination to have all things done according to the law both of the State and of the Church, he would incur the hostility of the puritans and the fury of the fanatics.

He communicated with the Archbishop of York, Dr. Harsnet, successor to Dr. Montaigne, who had survived his translation from the See of London but a short time, on the subject, and the two prelates resolved upon certain regulations for the peace of the State and the well-ordering of the Church. These were reduced into form, and presented by Laud to the king, who signed them, and issued them as "Instructions to the Most Reverend Father in God, George, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, containing certain orders to be observed, and put in execution by the several bishops in his province." By these instructions the bishops were ordered to keep residence in their several sees, and to dwell in their episcopal houses, "if they had any such." They were to give charge in their triennial visitations, and at other convenient times, both by themselves and by their archdeacons, that the declaration for settling all questions in difference be strictly observed by all parties. They were to take especial care that their ordinations should be conducted solemnly, and that no unworthy persons should be ordained. They were to encourage orthodox divines to take knowledge how both lecturers and preachers within their respective dioceses acquitted themselves, that so they might take order for any abuse accordingly. They were to take

Instructions issued by the king.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

especial care that divine service should be diligently frequented, as well for the prayers and catechism as for sermons, and particular notice was to be taken of all absentees, whether recusants or others. They were forbidden to cut down timber, or grant such leases as would impoverish their successors. "We think," the words of the instructions run, "that it is a hateful thing that any man's leaving a bishopric should almost undo his successor."

With regard to lectures it was enacted, that in all parishes the afternoon sermons should be turned into catechising by question and answer, where and whensoever there was not some great cause apparent to break this ancient and profitable order. Every lecturer was to read divine service according to the Liturgy, in his surplice, and before the lecture. If a lecture was set up in a market town, it must be under the sanction of the clergy near adjoining to the place, and the lecturer must preach in his gown, and "not in cloaks, as too many do use." Moreover if any corporation maintained a single lecturer, he was not to be suffered to preach till he professed his willingness to take upon him a living with cure of souls; and he must actually take such benefice or cure, so soon as the same shall have been procured for him.*

Puritan excitement against Laud.

Objection by Abp. Abbot.

It cannot be denied that some such reform as that insisted upon by these instructions was required, and that urgently; but against the head that planned them, and the hand that wrote them, fanatical intolerance was increased. The difficulty was the greater because the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Abbot, openly declared his opposition to the royal declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, which he considered an artifice to bring in "Arminianism;" and he also disapproved of the limitations concerning lecturers. He was obliged to communi-

* Bibl. Reg., sect. 3, number 7.

cate the instructions to his suffragans; but what he did was done with unconcealed reluctance, nor was he inclined to enforce them. On the contrary, such and so great was the archbishop's opposition, that when the Archdeacon of Canterbury, supposing that he was to act upon the instructions he had received, suspended two itinerant lecturers, he was visited by a stern rebuke from the archbishop. The primate restored the lecturers to their former position, and inhibited his archdeacon from his jurisdiction.* It is difficult to understand on what principle Archbishop Abbot acted in this case.

Complaint of the bishops.

Certain of the bishops also felt themselves aggrieved by the instructions. They thought it little better than banishment to be sent from the vicinity of the Court to their country dioceses. They complained of being called upon to maintain, in their respective dioceses, an aristocratic hospitality, when their revenues were unable to support it; some of them were indignant at not being permitted to make the best of their property, forgetting that they had only a life interest in it, that they were trustees for the Church, and for their successors. Laud saw that some reform was absolutely necessary, and that reform he effected by enforcing the law.

Chaplains.

The noblemen also, and various officials in State affairs, felt aggrieved when they found their own rights encroached upon by the "instructions," and regulated if not curtailed: the members of the Upper House of Parliament, and certain other official personages to whom allusion has just been made, claimed the right to appoint a certain number of chaplains, each according to his rank. This custom existed to the present age, and within the memory of men not far advanced in life. It ceased to be enforced, when the advantages previously conveyed by a chaplaincy had been superseded by the

* Cant. Doome, p. 513.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

statute law. The privilege was this: barons and judges, and officers of State were accustomed to appoint certain chaplains, who were thenceforward permitted to hold more than one benefice with cure of souls, or to obtain a dispensation of non-residence for chaplains who were members of their household. From these chaplains the lecturers had generally been selected; the order that these persons should accept a cure of souls, and reside on their benefices, was regarded by their patrons as an interference with their rights and privileges. This was of course known to Laud, who devised this mode of silencing the lecturers by whom the Calvinistic doctrines were propagated throughout the land.

Puritans.

With them the puritans in general made common cause; they affirmed that the purpose of the royal instructions was to suppress "the divine ordinance of preaching." In like manner, the order of catechising in the afternoons of Sunday, they regarded as beneath the dignity of their preachers. They were indignant that men who were capable of administering strong meat, should be compelled to supply milk for the babes. Their complaint was unreasonable, for although catechising, being the law of the Church, was duly insisted upon, the clergy were allowed to preach at other times, and indeed, to deliver sermons in the morning was expressly ordered in the Book of Common Prayer. The use of the surplice also was a great trouble to them, being regarded very much in the same manner as is the use of vestments at the present time.

Highly indignant were they at being prohibited from dwelling upon their favourite subject of predestination, and they regarded it as simply impossible to tolerate the preachers who dwelt on the moral duties towards God and towards man, and confined their preaching to God's will revealed by faith in Christ. The instructions were

thus assailed on all sides: by the archbishop, Abbot; by those of the bishops who were not distinguished for their orthodoxy; and by the puritans in general. The measure was a bold one, but, in enforcing it, Laud remained firm. His first step was to summon all the ministers and lecturers in London and its vicinity, and, in a solemn address, he sought to persuade them to observe the law. He pointed out the necessity of his majesty's instructions for the good of the Church, and he enjoined a cheerful obedience to them. He required a report from his archdeacons, which was to contain an exact account, at the close of their visitations, as to the spirit in which the instruction was observed.

Evil of itinerant lectureships.

Whatever was done, was done in the king's name and authority, and the king saw, as well as Laud, the evils likely to result from the itinerant lectureships. The folly of which the lecturers were guilty did certainly, in many instances, sound like blasphemy in the ears of piety.*

Bp. Davenant's offence.

The fault in this respect was not, however, all on one side; nor on one side only was the offence punished. The Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Davenant, when preaching before the king, in Lent, happened to touch on this matter, and incurred the royal displeasure. His text was—"Eternal life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vi. 3); and the sermon was not a very able or a striking one. The third point of his discourse was, that the godly are happy in the manner of their reward, because the eternal life bestowed upon them was *donum gratuitum*, or free and unmerited bounty. In enlarging upon this, he brought forward the prohibited arguments upon predestination and election; and after the sermon was over, he was told by the Archbishop of York, and others, that the king was displeased at his stirring the question, which, by the

* Cyp. Ang., p. 195.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

declaration, was forbidden to be meddled withal, one way or the other. The bishop, as it appears from a letter written by him to Dr. Ward,* had not intended to give offence, and he answered that he had delivered nothing but the received doctrine of our Church, established in the 17th Article, and that he was ready to justify the truth of what he had then taught. He was informed that the doctrine was not gainsaid. But he was reminded that his majesty's command had been that these questions should not be debated. The bishop expressed his regret that, carried away by his subject, he had unintentionally transgressed the royal command. Notwithstanding the apology, on the Tuesday following, Bishop Davenant was summoned to attend at the council-table. Laud was present, but he uttered not a word; he had not, indeed, a word to utter if the law had not been transgressed. The Archbishop of York (Dr. Harsnet) conducted the whole business. He made a speech of great length, wherein he accused Davenant of contempt of the king's declaration, and dwelt on the evil that might thereupon accrue to the Church. The bishop answered moderately and well, and maintained that what he had said could not be regarded as connected with "forbidden, curious, or needless doctrines." He professed himself sorry that he had not understood his majesty's intention, which if he had done, he would have chosen other matter for his discourse; and for the time to come he should conform himself as readily as any other to his majesty's commands. The Earl of Arundel, signifying that what he said was sufficient, advised him to urge no more in his defence, and without any further proceedings he was dismissed.

He is summoned before the council-table.

* Original holograph. Tanner MSS., lxxi. 39. Fuller, Book xi. 7, 14–16.

He desired to see the king in order that he might express to his majesty his sorrow at having offended, however unwittingly. He was received very graciously, but the king declared to him his resolution "that he would not have this high point meddled withal or debated, either the one way or the other; because it was too high for the people's understanding, and other points which concern reformation and newness of life were more needful and profitable." Having promised obedience, and kissed the king's hand, Bishop Davenant departed.*

Laud did not take any part in this affair of the Bishop of Salisbury, beyond being present at the council-board when he was accused. But it was, no doubt, from his advice, that the king took the firm stand he did with regard to unprofitable disquisitions on doctrinal subjects.

Personalities of the Oxford preachers.

The custom of preaching with violence and personalities, at Oxford, had been for a short time suspended; but the evil temper now reappeared. The question was revived whether certain ceremonies were innovations, or merely a restoration of what was decreed at the Reformation. Two persons—Mr. Thorn, of Balliol, and Mr. Ford, of Magdalen Hall—preached sermons in which they broke out into bitter invectives, made some harsh reflections on "eminent persons in the Church," and "fell foul on the king's declaration." The texts they chose for their discourses were significant. One was, "Let us make us a captain, and let us return into Egypt;"† the other, "And he cried against the altar in the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar."‡ The vice-chancellor, Dr. Smith, warden of Wadham, summoned the preachers before him, and ordered them to bring in the copies of the sermons. But they appealed from him to the proctors, Atherton Bruce, of Brasenose, and John Doughty, of Merton.

* Collier, viii. p. 47. Fuller, *ut sup.*

† Numbers xiv. 4.

‡ 1 Kings xiii. 2.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

They received the appeal, as if it had not been "*perturbatio pacis.*" The vice-chancellor was forced in a statutable way to appeal to the king. The king, with all the lords of the council then present, heard the cause at Woodstock. Laud did not approve of such appeals. He considered that the university should be able to govern itself, without having recourse to the king's authority. But the appeal having been made, he took care that the authority of the vice-chancellor should be upheld, and the preachers, of whom complaint was made, were expelled the university. The proctors who had accepted their appeal were deprived of their places, and others who had espoused their cause were severely censured.* Factious preaching, however, was not put down at the university by this measure, and we find controversy running high soon after. But it was not all on one side; and the Calvinists had no just ground for their assertion that none but they were prohibited, or that the opposite party went off unpunished.†

Appeal to the king.

Preachers expelled.

Cry against innovations.

It was now with regard to ceremonies that the puritans at Oxford, and elsewhere, professed their alarm. The leaders of that party made "No innovations!" their cry; or, as we should say in these times, the Opposition adopted it as a chief item of their political programme. The churches were, as a rule, in a scandalous condition, but the man who ventured to try to reform that condition was an innovator. The services of the Church were neglected, the ancient customs were disregarded, factious preaching was exalted into the place of the sacraments, the holy table was desecrated and used for other purposes than the administration of the Holy Communion, profaneness and irreverence abounded; and when Laud en-

* Fuller, xi. sec. 7, p. 18. Rushworth, ii. p. 110. Wood, Hist. et Antiq. Univ. Oxon.

† Cyp. Ang., p. 203.

deavoured to check these abuses he was "an innovator." He desired, as we have before observed, that all things should be done according to the law, and the real innovators were those who, setting the old laws at defiance, superseded them by Calvinistic observances. By the real authors of innovation, Laud was accused as an innovator, and of introducing new ceremonies into the Church.

Laud charged with introducing new ceremonies.

On the 16th January, 1630, he consecrated the church of St. Catherine Cree, in London, and on the following Sunday that of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. Modern historians, rancorous against the Church, and willing to heap opprobrium upon churchmen, have repeated the puritan representation of these consecrations. It is only just that we should hear Laud's own version of the subject, solemnly made when he was on his trial, and when the consecration was produced as an act of high treason on his part.*

Consecration of St. Catherine's.

Prynne gives an account of the ceremonies at the consecration of the church of St. Catherine † so ridiculous, that it is a matter of wonder that historians like Hume and others, should have deemed it worthy of credit. The bishop entering the church, says Prynne, after he had cried out with a loud voice, "Open ye everlasting doors, that the King of Glory may enter in," fell upon his knees, with eyes elevated and arms expanded, and uttered the words, "This place is holy, the ground is holy, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy." He several times took up from the floor some of the dust and threw it into the air. Approaching, with his attendants, near to the Communion table, he bowed frequently towards it, and then went round the church repeating some of the Psalms, and ending with a form of prayer, which concluded with the words, "We consecrate this church and separate it unto

Prynne's account thereof.

* Troubles and Trial, iv. pp. 247 *seq.*

† Cant. Doome, pp. 113 *seq.* Hume, Charles I. 1630 (vii. p. 91.)

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Thee as holy ground, not to be profaned any more to common use." The bishop, then, it was said, solemnly pronounced many imprecations upon such as should afterwards pollute the holy place by musters of soldiers, or keeping in it profane law courts, or carrying burdens through it. On the conclusion of each curse he bowed towards the east, and cried, "Let all the people say Amen." The imprecations being "all so piously ended," there were poured out a number of blessings upon such as had any hand in framing and building that sacred edifice. At every benediction he in like manner bowed to the east, and cried, "Let all the people say Amen."

The parody of this sacred ceremonial is carried yet further. As the bishop approached the Communion table, say his opponents, he made many lowly obeisances. After many prayers he approached the sacramental elements, and gently lifted up the corner of the napkin in which the bread was placed; beholding the bread, he suddenly let fall the napkin, drew back a step or two, and bowed three several times towards the bread. The same was done with regard to the cup. Peeping into the cup, and beholding the wine therein contained, the bishop started back, and bowed several times as before.*

All this is an exaggeration of the reverent behaviour of the bishop, invented by Prynne.

Laud was frequently accused of making reverence to the east, or to the Communion table, and there is no doubt that it was his custom to bow his head on entering a church. But he gives a reason, and his reason must be acknowledged to be a good one. "Shall I bow," he asks, "to men in each House of Parliament, and shall I not bow to God in His house, whither I do or ought to come to worship Him? Surely I must worship God, and bow

* Rushworth, ii. p. 77.

to Him, though neither altar nor Communion table be in the church." * He was not, on his trial, charged with the extravagant gestures towards the sacred elements described by Prynne, because the account was clearly ridiculous, and could not be in any way substantiated. The imagination of Prynne, stimulated by malevolence, drew the picture. But with regard to other points in the ceremony of the consecration, Laud was assailed, and it was stated that he had acted proudly, and in a manner "like unto Rome." One Willingham had watched the ceremonial carefully, and with no unprejudiced eye. "I did curiously observe," he says, "what was done, thinking it would be one day called to account." And the first thing that this witness remarked was that the bishop came in a pompous manner to the church. This pomp consisted in the attendance of Sir Henry Martin, Dr. Duck, and some others of the Court of Arches, in accordance with the usual custom. As the bishop, with his attendants, advanced through the west door, the words, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in," were sung. The puritans professed to believe that in those words a reference was intended to Laud, whom they derided on account of his meanness of stature. The profanity of such a jest, for we cannot regard the assertion of the puritans that Laud placed himself in the position of the King of Glory in a serious light, especially as we know that they were given to grim jokes on religious subjects, was rebuked by Laud. "These words relate," he said, "not to the bishop, but to God Almighty, the true King of Glory, who at the dedication enters by His servant, to take possession of the house then to be made His."

Laud's accusers and their charges against him.

With regard to the taking up of dust and throwing it

* Troubles and Trial, iv. p. 201.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

into the air, Prynne urged that "spargere cinerem" was in the form of consecration used in the Pontifical. Prynne was right in this; the Pontifical does order the sprinkling of dust: but Laud did not order it. He neither took up a handful of dust from the floor of the Church to scatter it, nor did he authorize, or allow anyone else to do so. One witness against Laud was not present at the beginning of the ceremony of the consecration of the church of St. Catherine, though he was ready to swear to the dust-sprinkling, of which, as he said, he had heard from others; and in the case of another witness, "he has need," says Laud, "to look well to his oath; for there was no throwing up of dust, no curses, throughout the whole action." * The "imprecations" of which Prynne speaks were not uttered, nor was the Pontifical followed. "I did follow," says Laud, "a copy of learned and reverend Bishop Andrewes, by which he consecrated divers churches in his time." † This form is now well known, but at that time it was asserted that Laud acted on his own responsibility, and at his own pleasure arranged prayers and ceremonies at the consecration. It was alleged that a prayer was used similar to one in the Pontifical. It was not said that the prayer was taken from the Pontifical, but that it was similar to one therein contained; this implied that any words or phrases used in the Pontifical were to be considered by all Protestants as iniquitous. Laud replies, "In the missal are many prayers like to the collects used in our Liturgy, so like that some are the very same translated into English, and yet these are confirmed by law. Rejecimus paleam, numquid et grana? We have separated the chaff, shall we cast away the corn too? If it come to that, let us take heed we fall not upon the

* These witnesses were Willingham and Hope, both much prejudiced against Laud. Troubles and Trial, iv. pp. 247 *seq.*

† See Bishop Andrewes' Miscellaneous Works, pp. 307 *seq.*

devil's winnowing, who labours to beat down the corn; 'tis not the chaff that troubles him." This was, in very deed, to make "*ex musca elephantem.*"

The accusations against Laud in this as in other matters were prompted by party spirit, as the "burlesque account" of the consecration of St. Catherine's church, given by Prynne, sufficiently shows. "The treason," says one of the opposite side, "is to seek by those ceremonies to overthrow the religion established." "That," Laud answers, "was never sought by me, and God of His mercy preserve the true Protestant religion amongst us, till the consecration of churches, and reverence in the church can overthrow it, and then, I doubt not but, by God's blessing, it shall continue safe unto the world's end." It must be remembered that the object of Laud was not to introduce new ceremonies, but to maintain the old. He was not contending for some unsubstantial theory, but for the very existence of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church of England. After his defence, little could be said against him with regard to the details of the consecration; but to any consecration the puritans objected. "That consecration," exclaimed a member of the House of Commons, "was ceremonial, and as such abolished by Christ's death. The most holy place, the holy city, and the holy ground whereon Moses stood, are styled so, though never consecrated. Our own Homilies say the church is holy, in respect of the people's exercising themselves in holy things, not for its consecration by a bishop."* Preaching, prayer, and the sacraments are sufficient, it was asserted, to make the church holy, without other consecration. Sanctification is but sequestering a thing from a common to a religious use, which may be done without a bishop's exorcism or conjuration.

* Rushworth, ii. p. 78.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The attitude of the puritans towards the Church of England is shown by these words; and it is upon such representations that Laud was, and is even now, considered by some to have been an innovator; whereas his object was to observe the customs of the Church of England; and of these one was, undoubtedly, the proper and solemn consecration of churches.

The projects of Laud.

Laud's mind was methodical. It was, according to Rushworth, at the close of the year 1630, though Wharton is doubtful as to the exact date, that Laud placed before himself certain projects, to effect which he was prepared to devote his life. He determined to erect buildings at St. John's College, in Oxford, where he had received his education, for the good and safety of that college; to overthrow the feoffments, of which we have anticipated the notice; to procure from King Charles all the impropriations yet remaining in the Crown within the realm of Ireland, for the benefit of that poor church; to set about the repair of St. Paul's, in London; to provide the new statutes for the university of Oxford; to settle the statutes of the cathedral churches of the new foundation, which were imperfect and had not been as yet confirmed; to annex in perpetuity some "commendams" to the ill-endowed bishoprics, and those, if it might be, "sine cura;" to increase the incomes of poor vicars; to take measures for the settlement of the tithes of London, between the clergy and the city; to set up a Greek press in London and in Oxford, for the purpose of printing the Library MSS., and to provide the types; to settle 80*l.* a year for ever, out of Dr. Fryer's lands, on the death of his son, Dr. John Fryer, upon the fabric of St. Paul's, till the repair was completed, and to keep it in good condition afterwards; to procure as enlarged a charter, in confirmation of the ancient privileges at Oxford, as that which was possessed by Cambridge since the reign of Henry VIII.;

to open the great square at Oxford, between St. Mary's and the schools, Brasenose and All Saints; to establish a hospital of land in Reading of 100*l.* per annum; to erect an Arabic lecture at Oxford, at least during his own lifetime, his estate not being sufficient, at that period, to make it a permanent institution; to settle the impropriation of the vicarage of Cuddesden; to have transcribed on vellum the records in the Tower; to procure a new charter for the College of Dublin; to make for the same a new body of statutes; to obtain a charter for the town of Reading; concluding with this determination:—"If I live to see the repair of St. Paul's near an end, to move his majesty for a grant from the High Commission for the bringing in of impropriations, and then I hope to buy two in the year at least." His affection for the place of his birth, and the place of his education, was shown by his determination to procure for St. John's College, Oxford, the perpetual inheritance and patronage of St. Lawrence, Reading. Such were the things "which," says Laud, "I have projected to do, if God bless me in them."*

We may pause to observe that these works were designed not only by a man actively engaged in the affairs of state, but whose health was so infirm that we have frequent references in his diary to illnesses which confined him to his room, and sometimes to his bed, during which time, however, his mind was almost always at work. We should have supposed that his zeal for the restoration of St. Paul's would have met with universal encouragement; but if he was assisted by the right-minded, we hear from Dr. Heylyn, that the puritans were loud in their declamations against his proceedings in this direction, "the repairing and adorning of a rotten relic; insinuating to the people as they found occasion, that it was more

Restoration of St. Paul's cathedral.

* Diary. Works, vol. iii. p. 254. Rushworth, ii. p. 74.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

agreeable to the rules of piety to demolish such old monuments of superstition and idolatry than to retain them."

Nevertheless the work went on with considerable spirit. Upwards of 100,000*l.* were collected, chiefly through the exertions of Laud, and of this sum the king gave at one time or another no less than 10,295*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* The houses which had surrounded and shut in the cathedral were purchased and pulled down; and an order was given to Inigo Jones, surveyor-general of his majesty's works, to prepare designs and the necessary material for the restoration. All preparations being made, the Bishop of London solemnly laid the first stone of the new work; Sir Francis Windebanke, then principal Secretary of State, laid the second stone; Sir Henry Martin, judge of the Prerogative Court, the third; and Inigo Jones, the architect, the fourth; each of these, by liberal donations to the workmen, inciting them "to proceed in the work with all honest speed."

The choir or chancel was first finished, and the work was carried on to the north part of the cross aisle; then to the western part or main body of the cross aisle, and so to the western entrance, and thus to the main body of the cathedral. Before the year 1640 the work in the interior was finished, and a "stately portico" was erected at the west end by the king. The partition at the west end of the choir was restored by the munificence of Sir Paul Pindar, at one time ambassador to the Court of Constantinople, who "adorned the outward front thereof with fair pillars of black marble, and statues of those Saxon kings who had been founders and benefactors to that church; beautified the inward part thereof with figures of angels, and all the wainscot work with figures and carving, viz., of cherubims and other images richly gilded; he added various kinds of hangings for the upper end thereof, and afterwards bestowed 4,000*l.* in

repairing the south part of the cross aisle."* Scaffolding was being erected round the steeple with a view to repairing it, and raising it to a greater height, when a stop was put to the proceedings by the troubles which befell Laud. The work fell with him. Directly after he was prevented from doing active business, the contributions fell from 15,000*l.* to 1,500*l.*; and this in one year. Soon afterwards nothing was given to the work. "This clearly shows," says Heylyn, "upon what wheel the whole engine moved, whose soul it was which gave both life and motion to that great design."

Controversies at Oxford.

The controversies at Oxford between the Calvinians and churchmen still remained. The expulsion of those seditious preachers of whom mention has been made, "expelled not," says Fuller, "but increased the differences in Oxford, which burnt the more for blazing the less, many complaining that the sword of justice did not cut indifferently on both sides, but that it was more penal for some than for others to break the king's declaration."

Laud, as chancellor, requires conformity to the law.

Laud did not in these matters appear as a controversialist or an opponent to the dogmas of Calvin; but as chancellor of the university, he simply required that whatever men's opinions might be, they should conform to the law. If the law was violated on either side, punishment must ensue. Robert Rainsford publicly defended the doctrine of universal grace, and Laud permitted the puritans to compel him to make a public acknowledgment of his fault, because he discussed themes which had been proscribed by the royal instructions. When, on the other side, a violent attack was made upon the chief men of the university, chiefly upon Laud himself, by Rogers of Jesus College, who dispersed some satirical verses entituled "The Academicall Army of Epidemicall Arminians, to the

* Cyp. Ang., p. 210.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

tune of the Souldier," the offender was expelled from the university. He was restored the following year by Laud.

It seems but fair to lay these statements before the reader, because it is generally assumed that Laud was responsible for all the severities practised in this age. As far as I have been able to investigate the subject, Laud was guilty of nothing more than acquiescing in the judgments of the Star Chamber and the High Commission Court. Before those courts he instituted certain prosecutions, but we do not find him writing private letters, as Abbot had done, to stir up the minds of the judges against the accused. It was said that in the Star Chamber "he was observed always to concur with the severest side, and to infuse more vinegar than oil into all his censures." This assertion appears to be certainly untrue. In a pamphlet published in the year 1641,* the writer, no friend to the archbishop, gives an account of an interview he had with his grace in the Tower. "My lord," he says, "I have been both an eye and an ear witness at the High Commission Court, when men truly fearing God have been called to the bar, and your lordship hath commanded to give them the oath, which, when they have refused, you have committed them to prison." "No," replies the archbishop; "it is well known I have shown great favour and clemency to those obstinate men, in that I have sometimes forborne them a twelvemonth together, and have in the meantime referred them to godly and learned doctors and ministers for satisfaction in that point; and

Star Chamber.

* "An exact copy of a letter sent to William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower, Nov. 5, 1641; at which his Lordship taking exceptions, the author visited him in his own person, and having admittance to him, had some private discourse with him concerning the cruelty in which he formerly reigned in his power; the substance whereof is truly composed by the author himself," &c. 4to, 1641. Brewer's note in Fuller, Book xi. sec. 9, p. 75.

when they, out of wilfulness and obstinacy, would not be satisfied, I could do no less by the order of the court than commit them to prison." The correctness of this statement was not denied by the writer of the pamphlet, friend though he was of the men "truly fearing God"—that is to say, the puritans. Another hostile pamphleteer says of Laud: "He observeth the Scripture in the spirit of it, useth his greatest adversaries with most meekness—I mean of the separation of the nonconformists; concluding that diversity of opinion will beget their ruin, and establish him in his station." *

The archbishop, when on his trial, deprecated being made responsible, as he so frequently was, for the acts of a court of which he was only a member—the one ecclesiastic among several laymen. "I assume nothing to myself," he affirmed, "that was done by order of the Court of Star Chamber; whatsoever was done there by common consent was their act, not mine; and if any treason be in it they are as guilty as I, for treason admits no accessories." † The punishments inflicted upon those who were condemned as libellers were, indeed, barbarous; and of all, that of standing in the pillory was, perhaps, the most iniquitous, for it left the amount of punishment in the hands of a rabble. It will be remembered that the punishment of the pillory lasted till our own times: and the writer of these pages has himself, when a boy, seen, on two occasions, men so punished. But in former times the ears of a culprit doomed to stand in the pillory were cut, and the nose was split—barbarities which were afterwards omitted. The cruelty of the punishment was in accordance with the ideas of the time, and though we should be glad if it could be proved that Laud had endeavoured to mitigate

Punishments of the Star Chamber.

* The True Character of an Untrue Bishop. London, 1641, p. 5.

† Laud's Works, iv. p. 107.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the severity of the law generally, we cannot blame him for acting, as he was bound to do, with the other judges in the Courts of the High Commission and of the Star Chamber, in enforcing the law of the land. He had, in truth, no other course to pursue, unless he could have effected an entire reform in the administration of justice, a task which he did not, perhaps could not, encounter. He was not a law-reformer, but simply acted as he was obliged by his position, as one of the judges in the existing courts of justice.

Laud not responsible.

The severity displayed against libellers in the Star Chamber was very great; but it must not be forgotten that these libels were often most malicious, and calculated to provoke men to rebellion. The case of Dr. Leighton was one of which some notice must needs have been taken, and some punishment inflicted. This man, a Scotchman by birth, in a book entituled "An Appeal to Parliament, or a Plea against Prelacy," indulged in invectives of excessive virulence against all authorities and powers. "Had he been an Englishman," says Fuller, "we durst call him a furious, and now will term him a fiery (whence kindled let others guess) writer." The "guess" to which the writer refers was that Leighton was in reality a Romanist, and the supposition is to some extent confirmed by the fact that at this time tracts and treatises were being circulated by Romanists against the Church of England, in the name and style of the puritans.*

Case of Leighton.

His libels.

Leighton's book describes bishops as men of blood—enemies to God and the State; the Church is pronounced to be antichristian and satanical, and the bishops as ravens and magpies that prey on the State; the canons of the Church are derided as "nonsense-canons;" the queen is

* Rushworth, Hist. Coll. iii. App. p. 29. "The papists boast that they have, beyond the seas, with them, his son, of another persuasion." Fuller, Book xi. sect. 7, p. 3.

styled a Canaanite, a daughter of Heth, and an idolatress; delight is expressed at the murder of the Duke of Buckingham, and Felton is held up as a man worthy to be imitated. Arraigned before the Star Chamber, Leighton was sentenced for his libels to be whipped and stigmatised, to have his ears cropped, and his nose slit.* But he managed to escape from prison, and fled into Bedfordshire; he was retaken, however, soon after, and suffered his punishment, while those who had helped him in his escape, by changing clothes with him, were heavily fined.†

His punishment.

A story was told, that when the sentence was pronounced upon Leighton, Laud pulled off his cap in the court, and thanked God for it.‡ For this story there is no foundation; and, in point of fact, there is no evidence that Laud was present at the Star Chamber during the trial. When at his own trial everything that could possibly be brought to bear against him was raked up, the severity on Leighton was not mentioned. With respect to Prynne also, whose hatred of Laud amounted almost to insanity, the archbishop himself states that he had no more to do with his condemnation than any other member of the Star Chamber. Prynne, however, attributed all his sufferings to the malignity of Laud, and persecuted him, as opportunity offered, even to the death. Prynne was a young man, hot-headed, and though very learned, not over wise. He was one who possessed

The case of Prynne.

Character and writings of Prynne.

> The unconquerable will,
> And study of revenge, immortal hate.

He was born in the year 1600; he took his degree of

* Rushworth, ii. p. 55.

† Diary, Nov. 9, 1630. The persons who favoured Leighton's escape were, by name, Livingstone and Anderson: they were fined 500*l.* apiece. Rush., Hist. Coll., iii. App. p. 32: and ii. p. 56.

‡ Life of Milton, by Charles Symmonds, D.D. Second edit. p. 221, note.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Bachelor of Arts at Oriel College, in 1620. At Lincoln's Inn he was successively barrister, bencher, and reader in law. He was a great admirer of Dr. John Preston, well known as an upholder of Calvinistic doctrines; "one who," Neal says, "affected the very language of Calvin." Becoming soon very ambitious of notoriety, he wrote books which, Fuller affirms, "were useful and orthodox." The reader of "The Perpetuity of the Regenerate Man his Estate" will judge for himself with regard to this first effusion of Prynne's; and he will probably agree with the historian, when he compares this with others of Prynne's works, that "he delighted more to be numerous with many, than ponderous with select quotations, which maketh his books to swell, with the loss, oftentimes, of the reader, sometimes of the printer; and his pen, generally querulous, hath more of the plaintiff than of the defendant therein." * Prynne published several pamphlets, the most notable of which was "A Brief Censure of Mr. Cosin's Cozening Devotions," in which he wrote strongly against Dr. Cosin's book, a "Collection of Private Devotions, or Hours of Prayer." This "censure" was answered by Giles Widdows, who had formerly been tutor to Prynne at Oriel College, in a tract which was calculated to do harm, even by its title, "The Lawless, Kneeless, Schismatical Puritan." † The tract is not the work of an able man, and no doubt it would have been wiser to have left Prynne to himself in his revilings; as it was, he revenged himself in a pamphlet entituled, "Lame Giles his Haultings; or a Brief Survey of Giles Widdowes his Confutation of an Appendix concerning Bowing at the Name of Jesus, &c." ‡ Of Prynne's style of composition, and his acrimony in disputation, a fair example may be given

* Fuller, Book xi. sec. 7, p. 56.

† Published at Oxford 1631. ‡ Published in the same year.

from this pamphlet. "This Giles Widdowes," he writes, "is a poor halting widow in troth, for traine and learning, of which he never had two mites; of whom I cannot say, as Festus did of Paul, that too much learning did make him mad, but want of wit." "Mistake me not," he addresses Widdowes, "as though I wrote this to suppress your answer. Alas! it is so illiterate, so absurdly impertinent in most things, that I rather pity than fear it. My only meaning is, to forestall your printed oversights, which are so many, so absurd, that most will deem you crackbrained when you penned, if not the receiver hairbrained when he authorised them." It will be observed that Prynne's strong point was invective, and he rejoiced in writing about what he called the "brazen-faced impudency of Giles," his "frantic oversights," and "foolish scribbling goosequills." It was not for these effusions thus "daintily worded," or for his Calvinistic proclivities, freely expressed in print, that Prynne was prosecuted;* but his offence was against the Court quite as much as against the Church; and by his "Histrio-Mastix, the Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedie, divided into Two Parts," he caused a considerable sensation.† His violent insinuations against the queen, her masquerades, dancings, and theatrical exhibitions, were such as to provoke to anger that most unwise woman, who was the first to render the king unpopular, and an object of distrust to his people. Prynne describes "play-haunters," as known or suspected harlots; dancing, as the devil's procession and invention, and "the devil danceth in dancing women." Lovelocks

Histrio-Mastix.

* Among other works by Prynne were "The Church of England's old Antithesis to Arminianism" published in 1629; and "God no Impostor or Deluder, or an Answer to a Popish and Arminian Cavil in defence of Free-will and Universal Grace," 1629.

† The title-page of this work bears date 1633.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633-45.

are "the wishes of vanity, whereby the devil holds and leads men captive."

The Histrio-Mastix was condemned by men of education, and the lawyers thought that such a work by one of their own body ought to be repudiated: the course they adopted was indicative of a sound judgment. They took the wise measure of treating the work with silent contempt, but showed their own opinion, by performing in presence of the king and queen, a masque, at Whitehall, in which the members of the Temple, Gray's Inn, and Lincoln's Inn, took part.* The occasion was the birth of a prince, afterwards James II. The statesmen were not so wise.

Prynne committed to the Tower.

Prynne was committed to the Tower, bail being refused, and Dr. Heylyn was ordered to analyse his book, and report thereon to the attorney-general, before further punishment should be inflicted. Heylyn's task was no easy one, for the "Histrio-Mastix" was a quarto volume of more than a thousand pages, and more than a thousand authors were quoted in it. With a retentive memory, and, doubtless, well-stored commonplace books, Prynne seems to have been absolutely without any power of arrangement, and Cicero and Stubbs, the prophecies of Isaiah and the chronicles of Froissart, ancient authors and modern authors, are all mingled together, and quotations are poured forth, apparently, just as they occurred to the mind of the writer. The result of Heylyn's analysis of this voluminous work was unfavourable to Prynne, and he was brought before the Star Chamber, where Mr. Noye, the attorney-general, prosecuted, and Mr. Atkins was chief counsel for the prisoner. In his speech on that occasion, the attorney-general made, of course, the most of Prynne's extravagant theories and statements, and he

Attorney-general's speech against Prynne.

* Whitelock's Mem., p. 19.

had a vast quantity of material from which to choose. "Finding the Church," he said, "so deeply wounded by Mr. Prynne, I do leave her to avenge herself of him, and to inflict such punishment on him as he deserves." Some of the "wounds" inflicted by Prynne were these, as quoted by Noye: "Bishops are silk and satin divines," "Christmas is the devil's Christmas," "Christ himself was a Puritan, and all men therefore should become Puritans."* "For the music in the Church the charitable terms he giveth it are: not to be a noise of men, but rather a bleating of brute beasts; choristers bellow the tenor as it were oxen; bark a counterpoint as a kennel of dogs; roar out a treble like a sort of bulls; grunt out a bass as it were a number of hogs."*

Part-singing in England had made a wonderful advance since the Reformation, and the great composers of the time had given their labours chiefly to the music of the Church. Marbec, the friend of Archbishop Cranmer, Tye, the organist to Queen Elizabeth, Richard Farrant, and Thomas Tallis, had raised the cathedral music of England to a state above that on the Continent. Byrde, a master of great genius, had died, full of years, in 1623, and Orlando Gibbons, two years later, had been laid in Canterbury cathedral. William Child, who took his degree of Bachelor in Music in the year 1631, was still alive, and was composing music for the church services. The labours of these eminent musicians for the furtherance of that art which we cannot dissociate from a service of praise, and which in many cases has the power of raising the mind from earth to heaven, were ignored by Prynne, and the results of their efforts were decried by him, simply, we must in charity suppose, because he had not a musical ear. Musicians would deem Prynne to have

* Rushworth, ii. p. 223.

CHAP. XXXV.
William Laud.
1633–45.

been mad when he wrote those words about part-singing; all must deem him to have been mad when they read his violent assertions about other matters, and in the present age he would have excited little feeling. A doctor would have been desired to examine him with regard to the state of his mind, and he would have been acquitted or sent to an asylum.

Sentence against Prynne

But at that time popular feeling ran high, and was greatly prejudiced. Prynne was a favourite of the people, and the severity of his sentence raised him in their eyes to the rank of a martyr. Lord Cottington, one of the judges, declared that "in the writing of this book the devil had either assisted him or he the devil." Judge Richardson and Secretary Cooke also pronounced their opinions; and the sentence was given that Prynne should pay a fine of 5,000*l.* to the king, should be expelled from Oxford, and also from Lincoln's Inn; that he should be degraded and disabled from his profession at the bar; that his book should be burnt before his face by the common executioner; that he should stand twice in pillory, and lose his ears; and be further imprisoned for his life.* It will be observed that Laud, then Archbishop of Canterbury, took no part in the proceedings, and did not, except perhaps by his vote, further the condemnation of Prynne.

Though this fanatic came again before the Star Chamber, we may here mention that he changed his opinions considerably in after times. A work by him appeared in 1649, with the title, "Mr. William Prynne, his Defence of Stage Plays." An answer was provoked by this, to which he replied by a publication, "Prynne the Member reconciled to Prynne the Barrister; an Answer to a Pamphlet entitled, Prynne against Prynne." † His

* Rushworth, ii. pp. 231 *seq.*

† A pamphlet published 1649.

character is shortly given by Wood. "As for this person," he says, "he was one of a hot, fiery spirit, and eager of anything that was put into his head, but afterwards growing weary of himself, when he had no enemy in a manner to encounter with, became more moderate and mild. And having fermented out most of his passion and venome, became for a time a happy instrument of the king's restoration, anno 1660, though there and ever to his last a bitter enemy to prelacy."*

Changes in the bishoprics.

The advanced age and the infirmities of Archbishop Abbot prevented his taking any active part in the administration of the Church, and upon the Bishop of London devolved in consequence a greater share of labour and responsibility. Many changes amongst the bishops occurred in the Church in the year 1632, for at that time died Dr. Harsnet, Archbishop of York; Dr. Houson, Bishop of Durham; and Dr. Buckeridge, Bishop of Ely, Laud's old tutor at Oxford and intimate and valued friend in after life. To another old friend of Laud, Dr. Neile, then Bishop of Winchester, the archiepiscopal See of York was offered. Neile at first refused the appointment, but upon Laud's insisting that it would be for the good of the Church that he should take charge of the northern province, he overcame his reluctance and was presently translated. By this appointment an important office became vacant, and to Dr. William Juxon, who had before, by Laud's influence, been made President of St. John's College, Oxford, was given the clerkship of the closet.† To find a fitting man for the See of Winchester, a most important consideration, not only because of the extent of the diocese, but also because the bishop is visitor of five colleges at Oxford,‡ was Laud's next

Advancement of Juxon.

* Wood's Annals, ii. pt. i. p. 395. † Diary, July 10, 1632.
‡ Magdalen, New, Corpus Christi, St. John's, and Trinity Colleges.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

care; and he recommended to the king Dr. Curle, Bishop of Bath and Wells. To Bath and Wells Dr. Pierce was removed from Peterborough, and to Peterborough was nominated an old and trusty friend of Laud, Dr. Lyndsell; "a very solid divine and learned linguist, to whom the Christian world remains indebted for Theophylact's Commentary on the Epistles, and the Catena upon Job, published by him in Greek and Latin."*

Dr. White, Bishop of Norwich, and Lord Almoner, the coadjutor of Laud in the conferences with Fisher, was translated to the bishopric of Ely; and to Norwich Dr. Corbet, Bishop of Oxford, one who had taken Laud's part firmly and consistently in his troubles with the puritans at Oxford, was removed; while Bancroft, a relation of the predecessor of Archbishop Abbot, and Master of University College, was appointed to the See of Oxford. And now Laud was enabled to do that for this bishopric which he had long intended. The impropriate vicarage of Cuddesden, five miles distant from Oxford, belonged to the bishop in right of his See. The impropriation was in lease, but Bancroft undertook to run it out without renewing; and when the vicarage fell into hand, as it soon did, he procured himself to be legally instituted and inducted, and through the interest of Bishop Laud, he obtained an annexation of it to the See, and built there an episcopal residence.

Another prelate, renowned for his opposition to the puritanical ideas of the Sabbath, Dr. Morton, was rewarded by promotion to the See of Durham; and in his place at Lichfield was settled Bishop Wright, of Bristol, and Cooke was appointed to Bristol.† The brother of the last-named person, Secretary Cooke, had not been friendly to Laud, and an instance of Laud's determination not to

* Cyp. Ang., p. 215. Collyer, vii. p. 50.

† Cyp. Ang., pp. 213 *seq.*

allow any mean personal feelings to interfere with the administration of Church discipline and appointments, is seen in this nomination. Besides in these great alterations amongst the bishops of the Church, Laud's influence is to be observed in other matters. Sir Francis Cottingham having been appointed Lord Chancellor, and also Master of the Wards and Liveries, claimed the disposal of such benefices as belonged to the king, in the minority of his wards. The Lord Keeper, Coventry, pleaded an equal interest in this, according to the privilege and usage of his predecessors. It had been a rule that he of the two high officers of State who first heard of a vacancy, and presented his clerk to the bishop, should have his turn served before the other. Laud settled the controversy by advising the king to take all to himself. "Many clergymen," he said, "had served as chaplains to the forces, and had ventured their lives at the Isle of Rhe, and some reward was due to them; here was an opportunity." The king acted in accordance with the bishop's advice, and committed the said benefices to the disposal of Laud, Cottingham, and Coventry, acquiescing in an arrangement which saved them from considerable difficulty.

Settlement of benefices in the minority of wards in Chancery.

The amount of work which Laud at this time accomplished, weak in health and feeble in body as he was, seems extraordinary. As Bishop of London, he had his particular duties to perform, which in themselves were onerous; but he had also to look after the affairs of the Church generally, for Archbishop Abbot, from age and infirmity, was incapacitated from work. As the adviser of the king, he had to consider the appointments to the bishoprics of which mention has been made, and he had also to prevent abuses or errors gaining ground, and taking root in the Church. He had an "eagle eye" in discerning such abuses or errors, and never lost time in redressing them. It is for this reason that he was accused

Great work of the Bishop of London.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

of being hasty and hot-headed; but in his activity and readiness lay the secret of his power and influence, which was so great that the puritans saw no other way of removing it but by his death.

The printer's error.

Busied as he was with high matters of Church and State, he also had his eye on other less important affairs. The king's printers made a mistake in a new issue of Bibles, and omitted the important monosyllable "not" in the seventh commandment. Laud discovered this at once, and the printers were called before the High Commission, and fined heavily for their carelessness.*

The painted window at Salisbury.

The parish vestry of St. Edmund's, Salisbury, had removed, at the instigation of Sherfield, the recorder, but without any licence of the diocesan, a large painted window, containing a representation of God the Father, as the "Ancient of days." The window, it was alleged, was somewhat "decayed and broken, and very darksome;"† but this would hardly justify the proceedings of the recorder, who broke the window himself with his pike-staff, instead of having it properly taken down by a glazier. Laud caused the king's attorney to exhibit an information against Sherfield, in the Star Chamber, for this misdemeanour. The bishop himself made a speech on the occasion. He spoke first of the power of vestries, and pointed out that they had no right to remove anything in the church that was doubtful, and that Mr. Sherfield, though authorised by the vestry, by acting disorderly in breaking the window, had laid himself open to a criminal charge. Then speaking of painted windows generally, "I am not of opinion," said Laud, "that images and pictures were not in the church till the time of Gregory

* With the proceeds of this fine Laud caused a good Greek type to be struck, for publishing works which had hitherto been only in manuscript. Cyp. Ang., p. 215.

† Vestry Book of St. Edmund's. Laud's Works, vi. p. 14, note.

the Great; nor am I of opinion that the first trouble about them was at the second Council of Nice." To prove this he quoted St. Gregory, who was 600 years after Christ; * Gregory Nazianzen, 200 years before; † Tertullian, "one of the ancientest fathers;" ‡ and Irenæus, the disciple of St. John.§ He deprecated the use of images, or pictures, if the same honour was to be done to the image as to the life, whether it were the picture of man, or of God, or of Christ. "Yet," he exclaimed, "there is a great difference between an image and an idol; but then if men give worship to them as to the other, it is unlawful." He did not defend the painted window in question. "I do not think it lawful," he said, "to make the picture of God the Father; but 'tis lawful to make the picture of Christ, and Christ is called the express image of His Father." "I don't mean to say," he continued, "that the picture of Christ, as God the Son, may be made; for the Deity cannot be pourtrayed or pictured, though the humanity may." But he proceeded to show, whether individuals regarded painted windows as tending to idolatry or not, those windows must be removed by some lawful authority. The Homily against Idolatry, which Sherfield urged in his defence, pointed out that the power belonged to the chief magistrate, and private individuals have neither *vocationem* nor *potestatem* to do what they like in those buildings which are consecrated and belong to the Church of England. Sherfield was condemned, fined, and ordered to repair to the Lord Bishop of his Diocese, and there make an ac-

* St. Greg. Mag., lib. xi. ind. iv. ep. xiii. Op., tom. ii.

† The passage to which Laud referred (St. Greg. Mag., epist. xlix. Op., tom. i. p. 810, C.D.), was, however, against the removal of public monuments, not images in the churches.

‡ Tert. de Pudicit., cap. vii. Op., p. 379. Cap. x. p. 392.

§ St. Iren. contr. omn. Hæret., lib. i. cap. xxv.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

knowledgment of his offence and contempt before such persons as the bishop would call unto him.*

The case of foreign chaplaincies.

The negligence of the English chaplains beyond the seas had for some time been a matter of complaint. The jurisdiction over foreign chaplains rested with the Bishop of London, and Laud took the case in hand, dealing with it at once.

It appeared that in some places the Liturgy of the Church of England had been abandoned in favour of the extemporary prayers and excessive preaching which were the characteristics of the Calvinian form of worship. A case occurred about this time, which came under the notice of Laud. The Earl of Leicester having been sent to negotiate some affairs with the King of Denmark, met, by appointment, at Hamburgh, Anstrother, the ambassador to the court of the Emperor. From Hamburgh the ambassadors were to be conveyed to England by the royal fleet, under Admiral Pennington. The ships, however, did not arrive at the appointed time, and the "elders" of the church at Hamburgh requested that the chaplains of the ambassadors should conduct their service. This they did, and they acted according to the Calvinian custom, repeating a Psalm, and proceeding at once to the sermon. When the fleet arrived, Admiral Pennington was likewise requested to allow his chaplain to conduct a service. The admiral had no chaplain, but in answer to the request of the elders, he said that he had in his ship one Dr. Ambrose, his friend and kinsman, who would readily hearken to them if they desired it. Consequently Ambrose undertook the service. But when the congregation was assembled, and the customary Psalm was well-nigh finished, a deacon was sent to Ambrose to

* Hargraves' State Trials, i. coll. 412–14. Hatcher's Hist. of Salisbury, p. 373. Cyp. Ang., pp. 215 *et seq.* Laud's Works, vi. pt. 1, pp. 11 *seq.*

ask why he did not go to the pulpit. He replied by demanding a Prayer Book. The deacon handed him a Bible, and said that they had no such thing as a Common Prayer Book, and never used such. "Why then," said Ambrose, "I have one in my own pocket;" and he proceeded according to the English use. But he had hardly come to the end of the confession before the congregation was in a state of astonishment. They had met together not for prayer but for a sermon; and the deacon was sent again to Ambrose to desire him to go to the pulpit, and not trouble them with what they were not accustomed to hear. "If you will not have prayers," said Ambrose, "according to the English Liturgy, in an English church, you shall have no sermon." The elders thereupon requested him to desist from an "unnecessary service," and Ambrose went out of the church, followed by the ambassadors and the admiral.*

This incident attracted the notice of Laud to the matter, and he soon had certain regulations drawn up for the purpose of impressing upon those who were under the jurisdiction of the Church of England, the fact that they must abide by her customs and her Liturgy.

Regulations for chaplains in foreign parts.

According to these regulations, no commanding officer was in future to entertain any minister as preacher to his regiment but such as should in all things conform to the Church of England, and have been commended by the lawful authorities. No company of merchants residing in foreign parts was to admit any minister as preacher, except he was duly qualified and commended in the same way; and every minister or chaplain in any factory or regiment, whether of English or Scots, was to read the Common Prayers, administer the Sacraments, catechise the children, and perform all other public ministerial

* Cyp. Ang., p. 219.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

duties, according to the rules and rubrics of the English Liturgy. If any minister should be found unconformable, or should with bitter words or writings defame the Church of England by law established, he should be presented by the commanders of the regiments, or deputy-governors of the factors under whom he lived, and be called upon to answer for his offence.*

By these strict measures Laud hoped to uphold the doctrines of the Church of England, amongst English subjects in those countries where the ideas of Calvin were deeply rooted. But while he did this, he also took notice of the foreigners who had settled in England. A certain restraint had been laid upon such in the time of Queen Elizabeth, her majesty having herself written a letter to Lord Treasurer Paulet, stating it to be her pleasure that the Bishop of London should take heed that in the church of the late Augustine Friars, which had been appointed for the use of strangers, divine service should be properly performed, and the sacraments administered.†

Regulation of worship of foreigners in England.

Laud now made some suggestions to the privy council on the matter. He set forth the great piety and compassion of this government in entertaining foreigners when persecuted at home, and indulging them the liberty of their own religion. He stated that it was never the intention of the government, that after the first generation was worn out, their posterity, born subjects of this realm, should continue in their ancestors' separation from the English Church; that such a distinct communion must, of course, make them disaffected to the State, and apt to promote, or fall in with, any change more suitable to their humour. He observes that they kept themselves a separate body, and intermarried only within themselves,

* Collyer, viii. p. 55. Cyp. Ang. Rushworth, ii. p. 249.

† Troubles and Trial, Works, iii. 424.

that by this particular management, as they are now a church within a church, they might in a little time grow up to a commonwealth within a kingdom. That these foreign bodies thus divided from Church and State, are for the most part settled in port towns next to France and the Low Countries, which may tempt them to strike in with an emergency, and make an unserviceable use of such a situation. That the example of such an indulgence makes an ill impression on the English, and confirms them in their stubbornness and nonconformity. And therefore he advises that neither the French nor Dutch churches should be tolerated in this kingdom, unless the English in foreign parts have the same liberty in doctrine, discipline, and worship.

Royal visit to Scotland.

On the 13th of May, 1633, Laud set out to attend King Charles to Scotland. The royal visit had been delayed longer than the Scotch people liked, for they expressed themselves anxious to see their king. But even now Charles seemed to be in no hurry to journey northwards, and it was not till the 24th of May, that, attended by the flower of the English nobility, he arrived at the city of York.* It was rather more than a fortnight afterwards that his majesty, greeted by an enormous concourse of people, and hailed with loud acclamations, entered the beautiful city of Edinburgh, where, on the 18th of June, the solemnities of his coronation as King of Scotland were performed.† About ten days after the coronation a parliament was held, in which several acts relating to the Church, the supremacy of the king, the privileges of the episcopacy, the disposal of benefices, and the maintenance of

* Heylyn speaks of a "solemn and magnificent entrance" into the city on that day (p. 225); but Laud says, "The king was to enter into York in state. The day was extreme wind and rain, that he could not. I called it York Friday." Diary, May 24, 1633.

† Cyp. Ang., p. 226.

CHAP. XXXV.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the parochial clergy, were passed, but by no means to the satisfaction of the Presbyterians.* They desired to have their own form of worship, while the king, like his father, was anxious to restore Catholicism to the kingdom.

Desire to introduce the English Liturgy fails.

Charles desired to introduce the Liturgy of the Church of England into Scotland; and when Laud was first made Bishop of London, he had expressed this his wish to him.† But when at Edinburgh a petition was presented to the king by the Earl of Rothes, signed by many persons of influence, for the redress of grievances, the main point being a complaint against episcopacy, Charles, though he commanded Rothes not to solicit any further, was so far influenced thereby, that he resigned his project with regard to the introduction of the English Liturgy, at all events for a time. Yet, according to Lord Clarendon, if the king during this visit, and especially after a sermon preached by Bishop Laud, which had made a great impression upon the audience, "had proposed the Liturgy of the Church of England to have been received and practised by that nation, it would have been submitted to without opposition."‡

It was indeed the misfortune of Charles on this as on other occasions, to go far enough to irritate, and yet to shrink from the last bold and decided step. Both the king and Laud were also too much inclined, like all persons of that age, to advance what they held to be the cause of truth, not so much by persuasion as by the secular arm. It had succeeded under Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and they did not observe sufficiently the change of the times. The chief lay reformers in Scotland had become zealous, even to bloodshedding and

* Collyer, viii. pp. 64 *seq.*

† Laud's Works, iii. p. 278. (Troubles and Trial.)

‡ Clarendon, i. 136.

rebellion for Presbyterianism, because they were enabled to enrich themselves by the spoils of the Church: sad complaints had been raised against them by the Protestant preachers on this point. The king had declared his desire, with the restoration of Catholicism, to rescue the Church property, and this, of course, made the lay reformers more fierce than ever in their ultra-protestant prejudices. It would have been good policy to have resigned all the property except that which belonged to the Crown, and to have left the Church in poverty until re-endowed by the piety of individuals. But the nobility were exasperated, not only by this step, but by the appointment of Archbishop Spottiswoode to the office of Lord Chancellor, and of other prelates as lords of the privy council. This was a favourite plan of Laud's. He saw the clergy of Scotland especially trampled upon, and he sought to raise their dignity by conferring on them secular offices, an arrangement which excited the jealousy of the lay lords. On the retreat of the king, therefore, the Presbyterian preachers, who still delighted in sedition, regained their influence over the aristocracy, and the feelings of the Presbyterians may be best described by a Scottish writer, who says, "They considered the deepest guilt, or the highest exertions of piety, to consist in matters to the last degree trifling or absurd. Their divines gave scope to their imagination in directing those ideal instances of godliness or iniquity. The second and fourth commandments were the favourite topics of their declamation. They could perceive idolatry in the disposition of a lady's headdress, or the adjusting of her clothes, and multiply, to an inconceivable extent, the variety of transgressions of the decalogue. The strict observance of the Sabbath they inculcated in its most gloomy austerity. To go on that day to the threshold, or to walk through one's own house if with a view to any

CHAP. XXXV.

worldly purpose, or even idly, was held a deeper crime than deliberate murder."

William Laud. 1633–45.

The king's return to England.

The king, before his return to London, spent some time in Scotland, visiting the country, the chief cities, and the most remarkable places. He then posted in haste to meet the queen at Greenwich, but he did not end his progress with an entry into London, or with any notice of the citizens of his chief city. Heylyn dwells on this fact, and compares the usual custom of Queen Elizabeth, who would never end her progresses but "she would wheel about to some end of London to make her passage to Whitehall through some part of the city, requiring the lord-mayor and aldermen in their robes to meet her, whereby she not only did preserve that majesty which did belong to a Queen of England, but kept all the citizens, and consequently all the subjects, in a reverent estimation and opinion of her." * Neither James nor Charles studied the arts of popularity. They thought more of the court and of their courtiers, than of the people and country.

Laud's return.

Laud did not hasten back from Scotland. He had not interfered in ecclesiastical matters; and he now indulged his taste for the picturesque, and for archæology, by visiting Burntisland, St. Andrew's, Dundee, Falkland, Dunblain, Stirling, and other places, attractive by their beauty, or associated with historical events, and he did not arrive at his house at Fulham until the end of July. Here the news met him that Abbot was seriously ill, and a few days afterwards it was known that the archbishop was dead.

Death of the archbishop.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 228.

# CHAPTER XXXVI.

## LAUD'S PRIMACY.

Laud's translation to the Primacy.—His friendship with Wentworth.—State of the Primate of England.—Visit of Hyde.—Offer of a Cardinal's hat.—Chillingworth.—Hatred of the Papists against Laud.—An accident.—Titles for Holy Orders.—Royal letter.—Sabbatarian question revived.—Republication of the "Declaration."—Ideas of the Puritans.—The metropolitical visitation.—The position of the Communion table in churches.—Opposition to Laud's order.—Headed by the Bishop of Lincoln.—Controversy thereupon.—Laud suspends the jurisdiction of Williams.—Cathedral statutes and regulations.—Chapels for the use of Foreigners.—Poor condition of the London clergy.—Object of Laud and Strafford in Ireland.—Condition of Ireland under Strafford.—Laud Chancellor of the University of Dublin.—The Thirty-nine Articles introduced.—Affairs in Scotland.—The Scotch Liturgy.—Riots in Edinburgh.—The Covenant.—Ministers of the Palatinate.—Visit of the Prince Elector.—Laud appointed Lord Treasurer.—Juxon succeeds him.—Letters of Laud against Puritanism, and against Popery.—The Archbishop's right to visit the Universities.—Royal visit to Oxford.—State of the country.—Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton prosecuted and punished.—Williams summoned before the Star Chamber.—Visitation of Jersey and the Channel Islands.—Laud's energy against Romanism, and Socinianism.—Further disturbances in Scotland.—The Short Parliament.—Proceedings of Convocation.—The Long Parliament.—Impeachment of Strafford.—The Scottish Commissioners in London.—Vote of the Commons against Laud.—Taken into custody.—Resigns the Chancellorship of Oxford.—Articles against him.—Speech in the House of Lords.—Committal to the Tower.



As soon as the death of Abbot was announced, Laud must have felt that he would in all likelihood be his successor. Yet of this he could hardly have felt certain: because on the death of Bancroft the eyes of all had been

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1623–45.

fixed on Bishop Andrewes, and although it was supposed that he was secure of the primacy, nevertheless he did not obtain it. Laud was quite aware of the intrigues of courtiers; and the courtiers, whose peculations he had resisted, were enemies to him, almost as bitter as the puritans. But passing over these considerations, he might fairly expect on other grounds a delay in the appointment. At this time, during a vacancy of a diocese, the profits of the estates were paid into the royal exchequer, and, to enrich the king, the appointment was often deferred. We may therefore believe that Laud was taken by surprise when, on the first occasion of his attending the Court after Abbot's death, King Charles, in his most gracious manner, with a smile on his countenance, saluted him, saying: "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are very welcome."* The king soon afterwards gave order for the despatch of all the necessary forms for Laud's translation, which were completed on the 19th of September. He was then confirmed Archbishop of Canterbury in his chapel at Lambeth; and on this day he made a "solemn and magnificent feast" at his house, "the estate being set out in the great chamber of that house, all persons, after the accustomed manner, standing bare before it." His steward, his treasurer, his comptroller, attended with their white staves in their several offices.

Laud appointed to the primacy.

It would seem that the king entertained a notion that Laud would not attend sufficiently to these matters of ceremony; for on his translation, his majesty addressed to him a letter, exhorting him to keep up the dignity and grandeur of the See of Canterbury. "We have given order," he says, "for your translation to the See of Canterbury, and we think it fit for the upholding of the honour and government of the said Church, hereby to

* Clarendon, i. p. 147.

require you in the form of your translation to use all such ceremonies and offices, and to carry yourself with the same estate and dignity, and to assume such privileges and pre-eminences, as your predecessors in that See have used and enjoyed heretofore. At Denmark House, this 8th of September." *

Friendship with Wentworth.

We find the friend with whom he was most familiar, Lord Wentworth, so far deferring to his increased rank, as to change his mode of addressing so great a man. He was playfully rebuked by the archbishop, and Wentworth's object was perhaps obtained, when he was assured by Laud that no differences which might exist between their respective conditions in life, could alter that friendship, which he regarded as an honour not less than a comfort. Laud maintained the cause of Wentworth at Court, and Wentworth carried out the principles of Laud in Ireland, although we are surprised to find Laud, in friendly terms exhorting Wentworth to be less vehement in carrying out what, though right, might not always be expedient. In Church affairs the viceroy fully concurred in opinion with the English primate. What was law to the Church in England he desired to make law to the Church in Ireland.

State of the primate.

The position of the lord primate was at that time so high, being, next to royalty, the first peer of the realm, that we can scarcely in these days realise it to our minds.

In Laud's case that position was higher still, from the secular offices he sustained at Court. English nobles and foreign ambassadors paid their court to him at Lambeth. The interior courts were filled with men-at-arms and horsemen; while holding a levée, or granting an interview, the archbishop himself held a court second only in grandeur to that of the king, while from time to time

* MSS. Collect. Tenison. fol., i. p. 225.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

messengers arrived with the announcements of important news, foreign and domestic; and when he crossed the river to the royal court, he had to tolerate rather than to enjoy the masques, theatricals, and gay formalities with which the king condescended to indulge his dissipated French queen. For this, though himself not accountable, he was assailed by his puritan enemies as an encourager of what appeared to them the works of the evil one.

To Wentworth's congratulations his answer was: "I thank you heartily for your kind wishes to me that God would send me many and happy days where I am now to be. Amen. I can do little for myself if I cannot say so, but truly, my lord, I look for neither; not for many, for I am in years, and I have had a troublesome life; not for happy, for I have no hope to do the good I desire; and besides I doubt I shall never be able to hold my health there (Lambeth) one year; for instead of all the jolting which I have had over the stones between London House and Whitehall, which was almost daily, I shall now have no exercise, but slide over in a barge to the Court and Star Chamber. And in truth, my lord, speaking seriously, I have had a heaviness hanging over me ever since I was nominated to the place, and I can give myself no account of it, unless it proceed from an apprehension that there is more expected from me than the craziness of these times will give me leave to do."*

Edward Hyde.

From Laud's letters and diary, we are inclined to think that the charge of abruptness of manner, though admitted by himself, and undeniable, was much exaggerated. A modern archbishop is not so great a man as a primate in the seventeenth century, employed as a statesman not less than as the head of the Church; but we doubt whether among modern primates we should find many

* Letters and Despatches of Thomas Earl of Strafforde, i., iii.

who would receive, as meekly as Laud did, the admonitions and advice tendered by a young man, as Edward Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, now was. Laud had evidently discovered the ability of Hyde, and was anxious to confirm the feelings which had already detached him from the puritan party. He spoke well of him on all suitable occasions, and took so much notice of him when he acted as counsel in any causes depending on the council board that Hyde received from the judges at Westminster Hall and other eminent practitioners there, more favour and countenance than was usually given to men of his standing. In return for the archbishop's patronage, he gives him the benefit of his good advice and a lecture. He had observed that the greatest want of the archbishop had been that of a true friend who would seasonably tell him of his infirmities. That deficiency young Mr. Hyde determined to supply, and with this object in view, with more of sincerity than of modesty, he crossed over to Lambeth. According to his own statement, he found the archbishop walking early in the garden, and the primate received him, according to his custom, very graciously. Continuing his walk, he asked him, "What good news from the country? To which he answered, there was none good; the people were universally discontented: and (which troubled him, most) that many people spoke extreme ill of his grace, as the cause of all that was amiss. He replied that he was sorry for it; he knew he did not deserve it; and that he must not give over serving the king and the church to please the people. Mr. Hyde told him he thought he need not lessen his zeal for either, and that it grieved him to find persons of the best conditions, and who loved both king and church, exceedingly indevoted to him; complaining of his manner of treating them when they had occasion to resort to him; and then named two persons of the most interest and credit in Wiltshire, who had that sum-

mer attended the council-board; that all the lords present used them with great courtesy, and that he alone spake sharply to them; and one of them, supposing that somebody had done him ill offices, went the next morning to Lambeth, to present service to him, and to discover, if he could, what misrepresentation had been made of him; that after he had attended very long, he was admitted to speak with his grace, who scarce hearing him, sharply answered him, that he had no time for compliments, which put the other much out of countenance. And that this kind of behaviour was the discourse of all companies of persons of quality.

"He (Laud) heard the relation very patiently and attentively, and discoursed over every particular with all imaginable condescension; and said, with evident show of trouble, that he was very unfortunate to be so ill understood; that he meant very well; that by an imperfection of nature, which he said often troubled him, he might deliver the resolution of the council in such a tone and with a sharpness of voice, that made men believe he was angry when there was no such thing. That he did well remember that one of them (who was a person of honour) came afterwards to him, at a time when he was shut up about an affair of importance which required his full thoughts, but that as soon as he heard of the other's being without, he sent for him, himself going into the next room, and received him very kindly, as he thought; and supposing that he came about business, asked what his business was, and the other answering that he had no business, but continuing his address with some ceremony, he had, indeed, said that he had no time for compliments, but he did not think he went out of the room in that manner.

"He was well contented to hear Mr. Hyde reply very freely on the subject, who said, he observed that the gentlemen had too much reason for the report they made,

and he did not wonder they had been much troubled with his carriage toward them; that he did exceedingly wish that he would more reserve his passion; and that he would treat persons of honour and quality and interest in their country with more courtesy and condescension. He said, smiling, that he could only undertake for his heart; that he had very good meaning; for his tongue, he could not undertake that he should not sometimes speak more hastily and sharply than he should do (which oftentimes he was sorry and reprehended himself for), and in a tone which might be liable to misinterpretation with them who were not well acquainted with him. After this free discourse, Mr. Hyde ever found himself more graciously received by him, and treated with more familiarity: upon which he always concluded that, if the archbishop had had any true friend, who could in proper seasons have dealt frankly with him, he would not only have received it very well, but have profited by it." *

From the manner in which Laud received such young men as Hyde and Heylyn, we are inclined to think there must have been perceptible an undercurrent of good nature which secured him friends, even though the defects of his manner towards those for whom he entertained no respect, created him many unrelenting enemies.

Offer of a Cardinal's hat

We must here advert to a subject which it is difficult to understand. On the morning of Archbishop Abbot's death, a person came secretly to Bishop Laud, and protesting that he acted with the assent of his superiors, offered to the bishop a cardinal's hat. The offer was renewed shortly afterwards (on August 17), and on both occasions promptly declined. Laud stated "that something dwelt within him which would not suffer *that*, till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time." † It

promptly refused.

* MSS. Collect. Tenison. fol., i. p. 225.

† Diary, Aug. 4, and Aug. 17, 1633.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

is difficult to believe that the person who made this offer acted with authority; it was probably a trap to make the bishop, now almost expecting the primacy, commit himself so as to expose him to the contempt of the Romanists, and to the increased malevolence of the puritans. "A cardinal's cap," says Fuller, "could not fit his head, who had studied and written so much against the Romish religion. He who formerly had foiled Fisher himself in a public disputation, would not now be taken with so silly a bait, but acquainted the king therewith—Timuit Romam, vel dona ferentem—refusing to receive anything till Rome was better reformed." *

This incident is the more difficult to understand, because there is no doubt that Laud was much disliked by the papists. He had been instrumental in thwarting their designs, he had confuted the arguments of Fisher, and he had been as severe against those who held the Romish errors as against those who endeavoured to lower the Church of England to the level of a Calvinistic sect. While he was Bishop of London he had been the means of recalling a promising pervert from the Church of Rome. William Chillingworth had been wrought upon by the Jesuit Fisher so much that he had renounced the communion of the Church of England, and had gone to study at the college of the Jesuits at Douay. Laud, who was his godfather, hearing of this, and being extremely concerned at his perversion, wrote to him on the subject, and Chillingworth's answer expressed so much moderation and candour, that the bishop continued the correspondence, and pressed him with several arguments against the doctrines and practices of the Romanists. The end was that Chillingworth left Douay, and returning to Oxford renounced his erroneous opinions and rejoined the

The case of Chillingworth.

* Fuller says it was offered by the pope; but does not give any authority. Book xi. sec. 7, p. 47.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Church of England. This is a notable instance of the way in which Laud worked against the doctrines and practices of the Romanists; and though his countrymen doomed him as a papist, he was regarded as an enemy at the fountain-head of popery. At Rome he was dreaded and hated, and a contemporary who happened to be in Italy at the time of his execution, says that there was much joy evinced at the sad event.*

Laud hated by the papists

At the same time Laud was always maligned and persecuted by those who were of the Calvinistic faction, which was then very powerful, and who, "according to their useful maxim and practice, call every man they do not love, papist." † Everything that he did was regarded with suspicion: his desire to restore order and decency in the public worship of the churches was construed by the puritans into a desire to restore popery, and fanatics were not wanting who threatened his life. Never was a man so well hated by those who professed to live and act according to the gospel of love.

equally as by the Calvinists.

On his removal to Lambeth, an accident occurred, which a mind like Laud's may have looked upon as an evil omen. It was, indeed, referred to at a later period by his enemies, and superstitiously regarded as a prognostication of his fate. On crossing the Thames, on his way to Lambeth, his coach, horses, and men were overturned into the river, on account of the overcrowding of the ferry-boat. Fortunately, no life was lost, and Laud mentions in his diary this escape as a signal deliverance.‡

An accident.

Directly after his appointment a matter of discipline came before the archbishop, which he at once took in hand. The canons of 1603 had ordered that no bishop should admit any person into the ministry, unless he had a true and undoubted certificate either that he was pro-

Laxity of discipline with regard to titles for Holy Orders.

* Evelyn's Diary. † Clarendon, i. p. 148.
‡ Diary, Sept. 18.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

vided of some church within the diocese, where he might attend the cure of souls, or that he was to fill a minister's place in a cathedral church, or was a fellow, or was to be a chaplain in some college in either of the universities, or was a Master of Arts of five years' standing.* The bishops, moreover, were liable, according to the same canons, to the penalty of having to keep and maintain those whom they had ordained without such titles, until they were preferred to some ecclesiastical living. Notwithstanding this strict canon and the instructions of 1629, Laud found that there were "indigent clerks," who either thrust themselves into gentlemen's houses to teach their children, and to act as chaplains at table, or who undertook some stipendiary lecture wheresoever they might find it, to the fomenting of faction in the State, the danger of schism in the Church, and the ruin of both; and therefore he received with gladness, if he did not prompt, a letter from the king, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was sent afterwards to the Archbishop of York, to be transmitted to the various bishops in the two provinces.

Royal letter requires an observance of the canons.

The royal letter urged a strict observance of those canons of the Church which related to such persons as were desirous to take Holy Orders. "We find," the king writes, "that many not qualified do by favour or other means procure themselves to be ordained, and afterwards, for want of means, wander up and down to the scandal of their calling, or to get maintenance fall upon such courses as are most unfit for them, both by humouring their auditors, and other ways altogether unsufferable." No man for the time to come, therefore, was to be ordained without a title, and that was only to be reputed a title, which, by the ancient course of the Church and

* Canon 33, 1603.

the canon law, was allowed. The bishops who should presume after this to ordain persons without a title, were to be summoned before the High Commission Court and censured as the canon enjoined—that is, to maintain the person ordained till a title should be given him—and "with what further censure you in justice shall think fit."*

This requirement of a title, which is made by every bishop to the present day, was necessary for the proper government of the Church. The evil of admitting any one who presented himself to Holy Orders without some such guarantee, had become very apparent, and therefore Neile in the northern, and Laud in the southern province, convened their suffragans, and in urging upon them the necessity of obeying the canon, implied that upon any future infringement thereof, action in the High Commission Court would be taken.

The Sabbatarian question revived.

No less hateful to the puritans than this strictness with regard to admission into Holy Orders, and limitations of the lectureships, was the course adopted by Charles in the matter of the observance of the Lord's Day; for through the extravagant zeal of Lord Chief Justice Richardson, the Sabbatarian controversy had been unfortunately revived. This judge—the "jeering judge" of Evelyn †—had assumed the power, in his own person, of prohibiting every kind of amusement on the Lord's Day; and when, together with Baron Denham, he attended the assizes in Somersetshire, he had made an order that revels, church ales, and the like should be utterly suppressed; and to this end directed that a copy of the order should be sent to the minister of every parish, who should

Chief Justice Richardson in Somerset.

* Rushworth, ii. p. 213. Laud's Works, letter LI. Collier, viii. p. 74. Cyp. Ang., p. 240.

† Evelyn's Diary, ii. p. 10.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

publish it on the first Sunday in February, and on the two Sundays before Easter, yearly.

This encroachment on the episcopal authority could not be permitted, and Laud communicated, by his majesty's command, with the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and desired him to make enquiries. "Some noise," he writes, "there hath been in Somersetshire about the feasts of the dedication of churches, commonly called the wakes; and it seems the judges of assize formerly made an order to prohibit them, and caused it to be published in some or most of the churches there by the minister, without my Lord the Bishop's consent or privity." The archbishop then points out that the prevention of outrages and disorders should be accomplished by the justices of the peace; but that the people should not be debarred from neighbourly meetings and recreations. He desires the bishop to send for some of the gravest of the clergy in his diocese, and enquire from them how the feasts had been ordered for the year past, and to send up an account of his enquiry for his majesty's information.*

Laud writes to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

The result.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells thereupon called a meeting of some seventy of his clergy, who, in answer to the question put, certified "that on the festivals (which commonly fell on the Sunday), divine service was most solemnly performed, and the congregation fuller, both in the forenoon and afternoon, than upon any other Sunday; that the people desired that these feasts might be continued, and that the clergy in most places were of the same sentiment. They believed that these annual solemnities were serviceable for preserving the memory of the dedication of churches, for making up differences by the meeting of friends, and for giving the poor a treat."

Richardson is

Richardson had been warned by Laud, then Bishop of

* Letter No. xlvii., dated Oct. 4, 1633. Rushworth, ii. p. 192.

London, that the king was displeased at his conduct; but he took no notice of the warning, and even confirmed his former proceedings. He was now summoned to attend the council, and commanded to reverse his former orders. He urged in his defence that the order he had issued had been suggested by the justices of the peace, and that he only acted as they requested. It is evident from the accounts given of the circumstance, that the justices were by no means unanimous against the old custom. "Mr. Prynne," says Laud, on his trial, "asserts 'that all the gentlemen in the country petitioned in the judge's behalf.' No; there was a great faction in Somersetshire at that time, and Sir Robert Philips and all his party writ up against the judge, and the order he made, as was apparent by the certificates which he returned. And Sir Robert was well known in his time to be neither popish nor profane."*

Warned by Laud.

Richardson received a very stern rebuke, and left the council chamber in tears. "I have been almost choked," he exclaimed, "with a pair of lawn sleeves."†

Rebuked at the council table.

A great many books on the Sabbatarian question at this time were published, the most foolish of which was one written by Theophilus Bradbourne, and the most learned by Dr. White, Bishop of Ely. Bradbourne was an obscure schoolmaster, or, as some say, a minister of Suffolk,‡ and was a zealous, if not a mad puritan. He went from place to place, loudly maintaining that Christians as well as Jews are bound to the observance of the seventh day, and that the Lord's Day is an ordinary working day. "But while he was in this heat, crying in all places where he came, Victoria, Victoria! he chanced to light," writes Bishop White, "upon an unkind accident, which was to be convented and called to an account

Books written for and against strict observance of Sunday.

* Troubles and Trial. Laud's Works, iv. p. 253.

† Cyp. Ang., 243. ‡ Wood's Athen., i. p. 391.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

before your grace, and the honourable Court of High Commission.* Bradbourne was heard patiently, and was answered fully; so that laying aside his former confidence he submitted himself to a conference, the end of which was that he became a convert, and acknowledged the orthodox discipline of the Church of England.

There were a great number of persons, however, who still held that the strictness of the Jewish Sabbath was to be extended to the Christian Sunday. "To do any servile work or business," they said, "on the Lord's Day, is as great a sin as to kill a man, or to commit adultery." "It would be as well for a man to kill his child as to make a feast on the Lord's Day." † In this as in many other matters, notably that of infant baptism, these men set up their own private judgment against all the testimony of the Church from primitive times; and while asserting their strict and stern adherence to the law, forgot or disregarded the spirit of the Gospel. Fanatics rather than enthusiasts, they taught men to hate the services of the Church, and the administration of the Sacraments, building up themselves on what they endeavoured to trample down, instead of inculcating a higher morality and more earnest godliness by the rule of love.

The king republishes the "Declaration."

Charles thought it time to endeavour to stay the puritanical proceedings, by republishing the declaration on the Sabbatarian question which had been set forth by his father in the fifteenth year of his reign, with a supplement.‡ In this the king stated that his express will and pleasure was that the feasts of the dedication of churches should be observed; that the justices of the peace should take heed that all disorders should be repressed, but that freedom with regard to manlike and lawful exercises

* Preface to "A Treatise of the Sabbath Day &c." by Dr. White, dedicated to Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury.

† Heylyn's Tracts, p. 490. ‡ Wilkins' Concil., iv. p. 483.

should be used. The justices of assize were to see that no man should trouble or molest any loyal and dutiful people in or for their lawful recreation, having first done their duty to God.

Attitude of the puritans.

This measure of King Charles was most unpopular, of course, with the puritans, and they determined to thwart it to the utmost of their ability. The Lord's Day must be regarded, they declared, as a strict Sabbath, with all the laws, or at least as many of them as they could interpret to their wish, of the Jewish dispensation, otherwise it would not be a Lord's Day. They pitied the king, but they blamed Laud, whom they rightly regarded as the real instigator of the declaration. A note which the archbishop had made for his own use was afterwards found by Prynne amongst other papers, which was to the following effect: "The declaration concerning lawful sports on the Lord's day his majesty commanded me to see it printed. The motives to it were: 1. A general and superstitious opinion conceived of that day. 2. A book set out by Theophilus Bradbourne, 1628, 'Judaism upon Christian Principles,' and perverted many. 3. A great distemper in Somersetshire upon the forbidding of wakes, and his majesty troubled with petitions and motions on both sides. 4. His royal father's example upon the like occasion in Lancashire." *

Laud's defence of his views.

With regard to the "Book of Recreations," Laud on his trial said: "It was ushered in with this scorn upon me, 'that I laboured to put a badge of holiness by my breath upon places, and to take it away from days.' But I did neither. The king commanded the printing of it, as is therein attested, and the warrant which the king gave me, they have; and though at consecrations I read the prayers, yet it was God's blessing, not my breath, that gave the

* Prynne, Cant. Doome, p. 148.

CHAP. XXXVI. William Laud. 1633-45.

holiness. And for the day, I ever laboured it might be kept holy, but yet free from a superstitious holiness. And first, it was said, 'that this was done of purpose to take away preaching.' But first, there is no proof offered for this. And secondly, 'tis impossible; for till the afternoon service and sermon were done, no recreation is allowed by that book, nor then to any but such as have been at both. Therefore it could not be done to take it away. Thirdly, the book names none but lawful recreations; therefore, if any unlawful be used, the book gives them no warrant. And that some are lawful (after the public service of God is ended), appears by the practice of Geneva, where, after evening prayer, the elder men bowl, and the younger train. And Calvin says in express terms, that one cause of the institution of the Sabbath was, 'that servants might have a day of rest and remission from their labour;'* and what time of day fit, if not after evening prayer? And what rest is there for able young men, if they may use no recreation? Then it was urged 'that there was great riot and disorder at wakes kept on the Lord's Day.' That is a very sufficient cause to regulate and order those feasts, but not to take them away. I make no doubt, for my part, but that the feast of the Dedication was abused by some among the Jews, and yet Christ was so far from taking it away for that, as that he honoured it with his own presence." †

The ideas of the puritans.

Englishmen cherish the time-honoured idea of a quiet Sunday—a day of repose and rest. Hence it is that a strong feeling is evinced in the present day against the opening of museums and public libraries on Sundays, not on the ground that such would be antagonistic to the due observance of the day, but because it would entail extra work on the custodians and officers of those institutions.

* Cal. Op., tom. ix. p. 99.

† Troubles and Trial. Laud's Works, iv. pp. 251, 252.

No such plea could the puritans urge for their attitude with regard to the observance of the Lord's Day. Their idea of religion was hard, stern, and uncompromising, and so they would turn the festival into a fast, and change the day of gladness into a day of gloom.

Laud is accused in this matter, as in many others, of acting in an arbitrary manner, and disregarding the feelings of the people. But another view may be taken, and as we read the history of the times, it appears very evident that the puritans were determined to have all their own way, and as they were the dominant faction for the time, for the time they must succeed. Laud's main desire was to uphold the principles and practices of the primitive Church, and whatever may have been the mistakes or indiscretions of King Charles and his chief adviser in other matters, we cannot but admire the firmness with which those principles of the Church were sustained.

The royal declaration was not strictly enforced, and none were called before the High Commission to answer for their opposition to it, except persons who were charged with other acts of contumacy and violence. Only three prosecutions took place in the archbishop's own diocese, and the offenders in these cases were guilty of other breaches of discipline.

Laud holds a metropolitical visitation.

While the Sabbatarian question was still being discussed, the archbishop, having borne his part in the matter, proceeded to hold a metropolitical visitation, with a firm determination to suppress abuses, and to encourage conformity. He entertained some doubt about the integrity of the vicar-general, Sir Nathaniel Brent, and therefore he associated with him his chaplain and friend, Dr. Heylyn, as a joint commissioner.* The archbishop's doubt with regard to the vicar-general was afterwards justified, for

* Cyp. Ang., p. 268.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The articles of visitation.

he appeared as a witness against Laud on his trial. The articles of visitation were carefully drawn up, and were substantially the same as those which before had been presented to the clergy and churchwardens in the dioceses of St. David's and London. Of most of the questions asked in these articles, with regard to the proper observance of the law of the Church of England, it is not necessary to take particular notice; but one or two may be mentioned, as shewing that Laud perceived with keen eye the abuses that had been growing up, and desired to stay them. The words of administration in the Holy Communion were in many churches used but once for a great number of communicants; so the question was put "Doth the minister deliver the bread and wine to every communicant severally?" There had been a great want of reverence for holy places and holy things displayed by many of the clergy, and so it was demanded whether in churches or chapels there was set up, in the ancient, usual place, a font of stone, without a basin, used for convenience, placed within it; and "a convenient and decent Communion table standing upon a frame, with a carpet of silk, or some other decent stuff, and a fair linen cloth to lay thereon at the Communion time; whether the same was placed in such convenient sort within the chancel or church, as that the minister might be best heard in his prayer and administration, and that the greater number might communicate." A "comely large surplice" was required for the clergy celebrating the Holy Communion, and no mention is made of any other vestments.*

Though these articles of visitation were afterwards quoted against Laud, they appear at the time of their issue to have been considered moderate and just. There was even a design formed by the thirty-six dissentients in

* The articles of visitation are given in the Anglo-Catholic Library, Laud's Works, v. pp. 381 *seq.*

convocation, to make these articles a pattern for all other bishops of the Church holding visitations, as they were "inoffensive and contained no innovations."* Laud himself refers to the satisfaction which they gave "while convocation was sitting." He says, "Dr. Brownrigg and Dr. Holdsworth came to me and desired to have my book confirmed in convocation, it was so moderate and according to law."†

The position of the Communion table in the churches.

But Laud's action with regard to the position of the Communion table in the church, caused a great ferment amongst the puritans, and this was made the question of the day.

For some years there had been in many of the churches great irreverence displayed—the buildings being regarded not as sacred, but as places in which men might meet together for discussion and for transacting parish business. Laud desired to restore the reverence with which holy places had of old been regarded, and moderate men on either side perceived the necessity of some rule of reverence being enforced, for the profanity exhibited by some of the puritan clergy had been very great, and would not be justified even by the puritan party of the present day. Laud desired that the Communion tables should be removed from the centre of the churches to the east end of the chancel, and this order was prompted by his hatred of irreverence, and his determination to promote decency and order.

Former desecration of the Holy tables.

The placing of the Holy table in the body of the church had been an innovation, and while no importance might be attached to the position of it, yet it was evident that divers evils had resulted from the alteration. On the Holy table the churchwardens now settled their accounts, wrote their minutes, and transacted their other parish

* "The Appeal." Heylyn, pt. iii. p. 8.

† Laud's Works, iv. p. 256.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

business. It was the usual receptacle for hats and cloaks, except when it was cleared in order that the children might learn their writing lessons upon it. During the sermon it was a convenient seat for any who could not find places to please them in the other parts of the church, and, being central, it was regarded as a post of advantage from which men could both see and hear.* The Holy table thus being put to all manner of strange uses, was not even protected from further profanation. "At Taplow," writes Laud to the king, "there happened a very ill accident by reason of not having the Communion table railed in, that it might be kept from profanations. For in the sermon time a dog came to the table and took the loaf of bread prepared for the Holy Sacrament in his mouth, and ran away with it. Some of the parishioners took the same from the dog and set it again upon the table. After sermon, the minister could not think fit to consecrate this bread, and other fit for the Sacrament was not to be had in that town, so there was no Communion."†

In their superstitious dread of becoming superstitious, the puritans found no fault in such irreverence and profanity, and under the lax government of Abbot things were proceeding from bad to worse. Laud when he directed that the Holy tables should be moved to the eastern extremity of the church, should be elevated a little above the level of the pavement, and railed in to prevent profanation, pointed out the difference between the placing of the Communion table in the church, and the disposal of a man's table in his own house. But though he explained his motives and dwelt upon the duty of

Laud directs that they should be placed against the eastern wall.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 272.

† "Archbishop Laud's Annual Accounts of his Province presented to the King, with the King's Apostillo, or Marginal Notes." London, 1695. Laud's Works, v. p. 367.

reverence, he was for this, more than anything else, accused of desiring "to advance and usher in popery." "It surely is no popery," he says, in answer to his accusers, "to set a rail to keep profanation from that Holy table; nor is it any innovation to place it at the upper end of the chancel, as the altar stood." * It was no innovation, for in the king's royal chapels, and in most of the cathedrals, the Holy table had, ever since the Reformation, stood at the upper end of the choir, with the large or full side towards the people. And though it stood in most parish churches the other way, yet there seemed more reason that the parish churches should be made conformable to the cathedral and mother churches, than the cathedrals to them. Laud stated that in point of doctrine there was no difference where the table or altar stood, but that it was necessary that there should be order and uniformity. On the ground of decency, he had good reason to desire that the Holy table should be removed to a place in the church were it would not be desecrated, but he had also a canon of the Church to support him. "It is plain," he says, "from the last injunction of the queen (Elizabeth), that the Holy table ought to stand at the upper end of the choir, north and south, or altar-wise. For the words of the queen's injunctions are these: The Holy table in every church (mark it I pray you, not in the royal chapel or cathedrals only, but *in every church*) shall be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood.† Now, the altar stood at the upper end of the choir, north and south, as appears, before, by the practice of the Church, and there to set it otherwise is to set it cross the place, not 'in' the place where the altar

* Speech at the censure of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton. Works, vi. p. 53.

† Wilkins' Conc., tom. iv. p. 188.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

stood, and so, *Stulti dum vitant vitia**—weak men as these libellers are, run into one superstition while they would avoid another; for they run upon the superstition of the cross, while they seek to avoid the superstition of the altar. So you see here's neither popery nor innovation in all the practice of Queen Elizabeth or since."†

Though the reasons given for the placing of the Holy table at the east end of the church, and railing it in, were certainly cogent, and must have been satisfactory to those who desired reverence and decency in the houses of God, yet there was much controversy on the subject. The puritans seem to have been anxious to seize hold of any grievance, and there were not wanting those in the Church who, while professing a love of order, were only too ready to further disorder, because they were opposed to Laud.

Bishop Williams opposes Laud's order.

Bishop Williams appears to have been early in the field, and in a tract which was entitled "A Letter to the Vicar of Grantham against the Communion Table standing altar-ways,"‡ he had endeavoured to prove that the body of the church was the right place for the Holy table, but he had not disproved the irreverence that had resulted upon its being placed in that position. His letter, or tract, was a few years afterwards republished, and answered by Dr. Heylyn in another tract,§ to which a reply was immediately given by Bishop Williams, in a pamphlet stated to be "written long ago by a minister in Lincolnshire, in answer to Dr. Coal, a judicious divine of Queen Mary's days."‖

* Hor. Sat. I. ii. 24. † Laud's Works, vi. part i. p. 60.

‡ First printed in 1627. Hacket's Life of Williams, ii. p. 100.

§ "A Coal from the Altar, or an Answer to a Letter not long since written to the Vicar of Gr. against the placing of the Communion Table at the east end of the Chancel, and now of late dispersed abroad to the disturbance of the Church." London, 1636.

‖ The pamphlet was entitled "The Holy Table, Name and Thing,

Still the great evil was not touched upon, that is, the want of reverence which had been so prevalent since the table had been placed in the body of the churches. Heylyn wrote a pungent pamphlet in answer to Williams, which he entitled "Antidotum Lincolniense," and which is interesting not only because of the views expressed, but also on account of the manner in which the subject is treated.*

Great controversy on the position of the Holy table.

"Such was the heat," says Fuller, "about this altar, that both sides had almost sacrificed up their mutual charity thereon, and this controversy was prosecuted with much needless animosity." Many others besides Bishop Williams and Dr. Heylyn wrote tracts or pamphlets on the subject, and the voluminous Mr. Prynne settled decisively, according to his own opinion, where the Lord's table ought to be situated.† The controversy took a two-fold form. Was the Holy table to be called an altar? Where was it to be placed? In regard to the first, Laud professed indifference. "Name or thing," he said, "give me leave to put you in mind that there is no danger at all in the altar, name or thing. What says the queen in her injunction to this? Why she says, 'that there seems no matter of great moment in this, saving for uniformity and the better imitation of the law in that behalf.'" ‡

more anciently, properly, and literally used in the New Testament, than that of Altar, &c." 1637.

* This was published in the same year. The reader may be referred to Hacket's Life of Williams, and Heylyn's Life of Laud, for an account of this controversy.

† Dr. Pocklington supported Laud's views in a tract, "Altare Christianum, or the Dead Vicar's Plea." Joseph Mede, a man of great learning, and many others, also wrote on the subject. Prynne's tract was called "A Quench Coal: or a brief Disquisition and Inquiry in what place of the Church or Chancel the Lord's Table ought to be situated." London, 1637.

‡ Wilkins' Conc., tom. iv. p. 188.

CHAP. XXXVI.
William Laud.
1633–45.

The bishops generally agree with Laud.

With regard to the second point he was very firm, as he knew well enough what desecration had in many instances taken place in consequence of the change of position of the Communion table. The bishops and clergy generally, in his province and diocese, agreed with Laud on the matter of the position of the Holy table, and it must have been gratifying to him to find his old opponent, Bishop Davenant, striving with him for decency and order. The Bishop of Salisbury issued orders to certain parishes in his diocese, in which he said: "These are to let you know that both according to the injunctions given out in the raigne of Queene Elizabeth for the placing of Communion tables in churches, and by the 82nd canon agreed upon in the first year of the raigne of King James, of blessed memory, it was intimated that those tables should ordinarily be set and stand with the side to the east wall of the chauncell. I therefore require you the churchwardens, and all other persons, not to meddle with the bringing downe or transposing of the Communion table, as you will answere it at your owne perille. And because some doe ignorantly suppose that the standing of the Communion table where altars stood in times of superstition, has some relish of popery; and some perchance may as erroniously conceive that the placing thereof otherwise when the Holy Communion is administered, savours of irreverence, I would have you take notice from the forenamed injunction and canon, from the rubric prefixed before the administration of the Lord's Supper, and from the first article not long since inquired of in the visitation of our most reverend metropolitan; that the placing of it higher or lower in the chauncell, or in the church, is by the judgment of the Church of England a thing indifferent, and to be ordered and guided by the only rule of conveniencie. Now, because in things of this nature to judge and determine what is

most convenient, belongs not to private persons but to those who have ecclesiastical authority; I inhibit you, the churchwardens, and all other persons whatsoever, to meddle with the bringing downe of the Communion table, or with altering the place thereof at such times as the Holy Supper is to be administered; and I require you herein to yield obedience unto what is already judged most convenient by my chancellor, unless upon further consideration and viewe, it shall be otherwise ordered." *

In the diocese of Bath and Wells, the bishop, Dr. Pierce, endeavoured to convince the people of the propriety of placing the table at the east end, before he insisted on the practice, and succeeded so well that there was little or no opposition.† But in London and Lichfield the visitation article was not carried without considerable contest, while in the diocese of Lincoln the bishop himself refused to put it in operation. Williams, when "in his good humours," had agreed with Laud as to the position of the Communion table, and in his own chapel at Bugden, in his cathedral church of Lincoln, and in the collegiate church of Westminster, of which he was dean, it was placed at the east end, where the altar stood before. But he now sided with the puritans against his metropolitan, and gave orders for railing in the Communion table in the middle of the chancel. The archbishop, consequently, suspended the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lincoln during his metropolitical visitation. The bishop stated in answer, that his diocese had never been visited by the metropolitan since 1285, during the episcopate of Robert Grosthead, and on the authority of certain papal bulls he claimed exemption. It was agreed

Laud suspends the jurisdiction of Williams.

* Copy of the Order sent from the Right Reverend Father in God, the Bishop of Sarum, to the Parish of Alborne. Laud's Works, vi. p. 61, note.

† Collyer, viii. 97.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

by both parties to refer the matter to the attorney-general, who decided in favour of the primate. The case did not end here, and the objections of the bishop to the metropolitical visitation were heard by the privy council, and declared to be groundless.

But the visitation having been held, and injunctions given by the vicar-general, Bishop Williams himself proceeded to visit his diocese, and by his personal influence he counteracted the order that had been made, and addressed himself particularly to those who adhered to Calvin and Geneva. An amusing instance of his dealing with those of his clergy who agreed with him is given by Heylyn. One Dr. Bret, a grave and reverend man, but supposed to have a strong leaning towards Calvinism, having attended a meeting in the archdeaconry of Buckingham, convened by the bishop, was no doubt astonished, and perhaps gratified, by the notice he received from his diocesan, who embraced him in his episcopal arms, and quoted the words of St. Augustine: "Quamvis episcopus major est presbytero, Augustinus tamen minor est Hieronymo," meaning thereby that Bret was as much greater than Williams as the bishop was above a priest.* Bishop Williams desired that the Communion table should have a rail about it, though it was to stand in the middle of the chancel, and by such half-compliance he deemed that he had frustrated the design of his metropolitan, and yet not openly proceeded against his injunction.

The visitation was carried on from year to year, till it had gone over all the dioceses in the province of Canterbury, and though in some places the opposition was great, in respect of the position of the Communion table, the result was satisfactory to Laud, and decency and order were restored in the churches.

* Cyp. Ang., pp. 270-71.

The state and actions of the mother cathedrals took up much of Laud's thoughts. Those of the old foundation, with the exception of Hereford, had their old statutes, which required no alteration. But those of the new foundation, which were such as had been founded on the monastic orders dissolved by Henry VIII., had, for the most part, merely a draft of statutes, which had never been confirmed, and could be altered or broken at the dean's discretion. Laud intended to perfect these statutes, and he was in a fair way of accomplishing his object, when the disturbances which took place in Scotland first, and then in England, prevented and disabled him.*

Statutes of the cathedrals generally.

For his own cathedral of Canterbury he composed a new body of statutes, which was sent there under the Great Seal, and by one of these it is enjoined that "at their coming in and going out of the choire, and all approaches to the altar, they (the dean and prebendaries) should, by bowing towards it, make due reverence to Almighty God." The hostility of the puritans generally was greatly inflamed by this "idolatrous observance," as they styled it; but some of the more moderate amongst them saw the difference between the adoration of the eucharist, and the reverence to God which Laud would inculcate. "The like difference," says Bishop Morton, a prelate by no means suspected of any bias towards popery, "may be discerned between their (the papists') manner of reverence in bowing towards the altar for adoration of the eucharist only, and ours in bowing, as well when there is no eucharist on the table, as when there is, which is not to the table of the Lord, but to the Lord of the table, to testify the communion of all faithful communicants therewith, even as the people of God did in adoring him before the ark, his footstool."

Of Canterbury.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 274.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The use of copes.

The use of copes, which Laud enjoined in cathedrals and college chapels, was another great ground of offence. "There were copes used in some colleges," says one Bendy,* a witness against Laud on his trial, "and a traveller might say, upon the sight of them, that he saw first such a thing upon the pope's back." "This wise man," replies Laud, "might have said as much of a gown; he saw a gown on the pope's back, therefore a Protestant may not wear one: or, entering into St. Paul's, he may cry, Down with it, for I saw the pope in just such another church in Rome."† Laud simply acted according to law, and by the law copes were not only allowed, but in cathedrals required. "They are allowed," he says, "at times of Communion by the canons of the Church."‡ Of other vestments he makes no mention, and it is evident that none such were in use at that time. The use of copes was confined to cathedrals and collegiate or episcopal chapels.

Of wafer-bread.

Other matters were urged against Laud, with regard to the Communion, and it was confidently stated that he ordered the use of wafers, according to the Romish custom, instead of bread. He denied this, and was amazed that the charge had been brought against him. "For wafers," he says, "I never either gave or received the Communion but in ordinary bread. At Westminster, I knew it was sometimes used, but as a thing indifferent."§

Laud accused of holding the doctrine of transubstantiation,

In making such charges as these against Archbishop Laud, the puritans, of course, did not forget to accuse him of holding the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. The removing of the holy tables, and the reverence inculcated for holy things, were regarded as proofs of his

* This Bendy was employed with Prynne to search the archbishop's study. *See* Cant. Doome, p. 66.

† Troubles and Trial. Laud's Works, iv. p. 221.

‡ Can. Eccles. Ang., p. 24. Laud's Works, iv. pp. 201, 210, 221–23.

§ Works, iv. p. 251.

error, and a speech made by him in the Star Chamber was considered conclusive. The words he used were these, "The altar is the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis *Hoc est corpus meum*, This is my body; but in the other it is at most but *Hoc est verbum meum*, This is my word; and a greater reverence is due to the body than the word of the Lord." But Laud denied that by these words the idea of transubstantiation was in any way implied. "I perceive," he says, "transubstantiation is confounded with the real presence, whereas these have a wide difference. And Calvin grants a real and true presence, yea, and he grants *realiter* too, and yet no man a greater enemy to transubstantiation than he, as I have proved at large in my book against Fisher. And, secondly, the word 'there' makes nothing against this. For after the words of consecration are past, be the minister never so unworthy, yet 'tis infallibly *Hoc est corpus meum* to every worthy receiver: so is it not *Hoc est verbum meum* from the pulpit to the best of hearers, nor by the best of preachers since the apostles' time. And St. Paul tells us * of a great sin committed in his time, 'of not discerning the Lord's body,' when unworthy communicants received it. Where was this? Why it was 'there,' at the Holy table or altar, where they received, yet did not 'discern.' I hope for all this that St. Paul did not maintain transubstantiation. As I call the Holy table the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, so doth a learned divine of this Church call the celebration of the eucharist 'the crown of public service, and the most solemn and chief work of Christian assemblies;' † and he a man known to be far from affect-

denies the truth of the accusation.

* 1 Cor. xi. 29.

† Thorndike, "Of Assemblies." Works, i. p. 274. Oxf., 1844. Herbert Thorndike was Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. After the Restoration he was appointed to a stall in Westminster Abbey. (Todd's Life of Walton, i. pp. 209 *seq.*)

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

ing popery in the least. And all divines agree in this, which our Saviour himself teaches,* that there is the same effect of the passion of Christ, and of this blessed sacrament, worthily received.†

Laud repairs his chapels.

While compelling others to perform their duty, the archbishop was a strict observer of that which devolved upon himself. When he first went to Lambeth, he found the windows broken and defaced, the stained glass patched up with ordinary glass, and all things in such a state, that he "was ashamed to see it, and could not enter the chapel without disdain." He also repaired his chapel at Croydon, whither he frequently retired for meditation and repose.

In chapels for the use of foreigners,

The archbishop's visitation brought under his notice the condition of certain chapels, of which mention has been made before, which had been tolerated in former times for the convenience of foreigners who had settled in England and were unable from ignorance of our language to conform to the orders of the national Church. Laud enjoined by the royal authority that those members of the foreign congregations who had been born in England, and were in fact Englishmen, should attend their parish churches, and that those who were not natives should use the Liturgy of the Church, translated into their own language. The chief personages in these conventicles assembled in London, and determined upon an address to the archbishop. He, in reply, informed them that he did nothing without consent of the king in council: that their conventicles were nurseries of schism, which it was his duty to prevent: that they were forming an "imperium in imperio;" that he governed solely

the English Liturgy to be used.

* St. Matt. xxvi. 26. "Idem est effectus Passionis Christi et Eucharistiæ." Thom. Aquin. Summ. Theol., pt. iii. p. 9. lxxix. A. *l.c.*

† Troubles and Trial. Works, iv. pp. 284–5.

by the canons, and as long as he did so the king would maintain him in his authority: that their congregations and the silencing of two or three preachers were not to be balanced with the peace and happiness of the Church of England: that their ignorance of the English language was no excuse, as they knew it very well when transacting their ordinary business: and that he was resolved that they should comply with his requisitions at the appointed time, which was fixed for March 15, 1634–5. A petition against the archiepiscopal injunctions was presented to the king, and the king insisted on the first injunction, while the archbishop qualified his second by ordering that those who were foreigners by birth might still attend their own peculiar worship.

The puritans take up the case.

The puritan party took up the cause of the foreigners with vehemence; and in 1635 obtained for them an additional proviso that they should contribute to the support of their ministers and the maintenance of their poor; and that a protection, if they desired it, would be obtained from the king against all who should molest them in their manufactures.*

Most exaggerated statements were propagated throughout the country by the puritans, who regarded these foreign conventicles as among their strongholds. The puritans denounced all who did not preach the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, as papists and atheists; whereas when we examine the conduct of Laud he remained true to that which he regarded as the constitutional principle of the age. He permitted to the clergy the latitude of interpretation which the Church allowed. He did not require them to preach certain doctrines and adopt a certain phraseology, but, so long as they held fast the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, what he required was conformity

* Cyp. Ang., p. 264. Troubles and Trial, pp. 165, 374. Echard, ii. p. 114.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

to the Church ; or in other words, in ecclesiastical as well as civil matters, he insisted upon obedience to the law.

Laud's own account of the foreigners made on his trial and passing uncontradicted, was that they lived in England as if they were a kind of God's Israel in Egypt, to the great dishonour of the Church of England, to which at first they fled for shelter against persecution. He said that they lived here, and yet for the most part scorned to learn our language or to converse with any except for the advantage of bargaining, and that they would take no Englishman to be their apprentice or teach them their manufactures. If after many descents of their children, born in the land and therefore native subjects, those children of theirs should refuse to pray and communicate with the Church of England, into whose bosom their parents fled at first for succour, accounting it not only for a true church but for a glorious church, he thought that no State could with safety, or in wisdom, endure it.*

Though Laud seems to have acted with what would now be called great severity in respect of the foreign congregations, he was only following out his rule that the law must be enforced; and that the severity was tempered with some tolerance is evident, from the fact that in 1635 he received an address from the ministers and elders of the French and Dutch churches of the city of Norwich, thanking him for the conduct he had displayed in all these proceedings. The letter, which the archbishop declared he had in his possession at the time of his trial, is the more valuable, as it was declared by Roger Coke, a violent puritan, that on account of these measures many thousand families had been induced to leave the land.†

Laud's endeavours in behalf

Laud must have felt what a hopeless task it was to endeavour to bring the French and Dutch congregations to

* Troubles and Trial. Works, iii. pp. 421 *seq.*

† Laud's Works, iii. p. 424. Lawson, ii. p. 83.

communion with the Church of England, but he persevered, and he thought that by stimulating the energy of the clergy he might have a better chance of success. When Bishop of London the poverty of the London clergy had attracted his notice, and he was determined now, with fuller power, to supply a remedy. The lecturers, as being "creatures of the people," and depending wholly upon the gifts of the citizens, had, in a great measure, superseded the regular clergy, not so much on account of their merits, as because, by a general fraud, the tithes and offerings had been diminished, in order that these lecturers and "trencher-chaplains" should be fed and supported.*

of the London clergy.

The clergy may not have been sufficiently active at that time, but they could not be left to starve. If the preachers of sedition—for when we read the effusions of these lecturers we can call them by no other name—found favour with the citizens of London, it was no reason that the dues appointed by law should be denied to the clergy. In the twenty-fifth year of Henry VIII., the sum of two shillings and ninepence in the pound was agreed to be paid by the citizens of London to the clergy. This was a great diminution from what had been before;† but so many were the evasions made, that the clergy in the reign of James had been obliged to have recourse to the Exchequer, by which court it was decided that this tithe of the houses justly belonged to the benefice. But with the rise of puritanism the opposition became great and almost insurmountable. The clergy, reduced to poverty, declared that they had no means to discover the true value of their rents. The case, at first submitted to the king, was by him referred to the archbishop and

Their poverty.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 266.

† The order of Roger Niger, Bishop of London, in 1228, was "that the cityzens should pay of every pound's rent by the year, of all houses, shops, &c., the sum of 3*s.* 4*d.*, as time out of mind had been paid."

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the other members of the council, and when Bishop Juxon became Lord Treasurer, the condition of the clergy was certainly improved. No doubt the archbishop would have carried that improvement further had not the troubles of the time increased upon him. His attempt thus to benefit the clergy was one of the crimes laid to his charge at his trial.

Laud's intercourse with Lord Wentworth (the Earl of Strafford). His letters.

The attention of Laud was now called to the state of Ireland, and he felt an earnest desire to assist the Lord Deputy, to whom we give his historical name of Strafford, although at that time he was Lord Wentworth. The letters which passed between these eminent persons are of the greatest interest, and they shew how deep was the affection which the one entertained for the other. The archbishop condescended frequently, in this correspondence, to abandon his usually stiff style of writing, and, indeed, to indulge in jocosity. Referring to the Bishop of Cork: "I never dreamt of the bishop," he writes, "but thought that the physic you had given that lord had made him vomit up all those learned old ends of gold and silver." "I perceive you go still on in the practice of physic, and you have hitherto had a very good hand. If this patient prove well after the vomiting up of four vicarages (which, certainly, whatever he thought, lay heavier upon his conscience than any surfeit upon his stomach could do), you shall by my consent proceed doctor in that faculty; and because I mean to have some honour by you, you shall proceed out of St. John's in Oxford, another manner of college than your Cambridge pair of panniers." His letter he describes "for all the world like a beggar's coat, patch upon patch."*

The common object of Laud and Strafford.

It is evident from these documents that Laud and Strafford were agreed in maintaining the constitution as they

* Letter ccxliii.

found it, which, as we have before remarked, consisted in an exercise of the royal will, except where limited by the Great Charter, and subsequent acts of parliament. This was an immense power to be left in the hands of one man, who excited the jealousy of the people, when he sought to strengthen his own opinions by calling in the aid of an adviser. That the power was often injudiciously and sometimes tyrannically employed by Laud and Strafford, to further their ends, cannot be denied. But their ends were not the advancement of their private interests, but the promotion of the public good. It is not to be forgotten that Strafford brought Ireland under submission to the law, and that, if his actions were peremptory, what he did, to the loss of his life, was done with less compunction, and with unscrupulous determination, by Oliver Cromwell, to his own honour, and the praise of posterity.

The same impartial historian who gives an account of what Laud accomplished before his troubles began, refers also to Ireland under the rule of Strafford. "The government of Ireland," he says, "had scarcely passed into the hands of Strafford, ere that kingdom, which till then had been only a trouble and expense to the Crown, became a source of riches and strength. Its public debt was paid; the revenue, previously collected without system and squandered without shame, was regularly administered, and soon rose above the expenditure; the nobles were no longer allowed to oppress the people with impunity, or the aristocratic and religious factions to tear each other to pieces, in full liberty, as theretofore. The army, which Strafford found weak, without clothes, without discipline, was recruited, well disciplined, well paid, and ceased to pillage the inhabitants. Favoured by order, commerce flourished, manufactories were established, agriculture advanced. In short, Ireland

Ireland under the rule of Strafford.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

was governed arbitrarily, harshly, often even with odious violence; but yet, to the interest of general civilisation and royal power, instead of being as formerly, a prey to the greedy extortion of revenue officers, high and low, and to the domination of a selfish and ignorant aristocracy."*

In the year 1630, Bishop Bedell had informed Laud that in Ireland there was a popish clergy more numerous by far than the English clergy: that they were in full exercise of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by their vicars-general and officials, who were so confident as to "uncommunicate" those that came to the courts of the Protestant bishops. When Strafford was appointed to succeed Lord Falkland as chief governor of Ireland, Laud, then Bishop of London, lost no time in writing to him, to entreat him to direct his attention to maintaining the law of the Church, and to reform abuses. He urged him to dedicate to God's service St. Andrew's church at Dublin, which had been for many years used as a stable for his predecessors.† He exhorted him to bestir himself in the great cause of impropriations, the king being willing to give back to God and His service, the property accruing to him from that source; and he advised him to consult the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, as to the best measure of providing a maintenance for the ministers of religion in that kingdom.‡

This letter, dated April 30th, 1633, was the first that Laud sent to Strafford, and commenced a correspondence without perusing which no one should sit in judgment on the character of Laud, or that of his illustrious friend. Here we see the entire confidence which the one reposed

* Guizot's Hist. of Eng. Rev., p. 40. Hazlitt's trans., 1854.

† See letter from the Lords Justices to the Lord Deputy, Feb. 26, 1631. Strafforde Letters, i. p. 68.

‡ Letter xlii. Works, vi. p. 307. Strafforde Letters, i. pp. 81–2.

in the other, and not unfrequently, as has been said, an interchange of wit, which, though decidedly cumbrous, reveals something of the inner feelings of men whose conduct appeared to the public to be stern.

Laud appointed Chancellor of Dublin University.

Laud was very unwilling to accept the honour of the chancellorship of the University of Dublin, for he had work and trouble enough at home, and he also wished the Lord Deputy to be appointed, who, being on the spot, would be able to do the body more good.* But finding that there was no chance of Strafford's appointment, he received the seals of the university on the thirteenth of May, 1634, having been elected the September previously, and set to work with his usual energy to benefit the institution. He succeeded in obtaining a new charter for Trinity College, Dublin, and a new body of statutes to rectify its government; so in his list of "things to be accomplished," he was enabled to write, in this case, the satisfactory word "done."

The Thirty-nine Articles introduced in the convocation.

He also carried the point of having the Thirty-nine Articles recognised in the convocation held at Dublin, acting here in opposition to Ussher, who, from his Calvinistic notions, preferred the Lambeth Articles. This is a confirmation of what we have elsewhere observed, that the puritans in that age did not understand those Articles in the Calvinistic sense which fifty years ago the Calvinists in England sought to attach to them. Laud anticipated the objections of Archbishop Ussher. "I knew," he writes to Strafford, "how you would find my Lord Primate affected to the Articles of Ireland; but I am glad that the trouble that hath been in it will end there, without advertising of it over to us. And whereas you propose to have the Articles of England received in *ipsissimis verbis*, and leave the other, as no way concerned, neither affirmed nor denied, you are certainly in the right, and

* Letter lxv. Works, vi. p. 355.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

so says the king (to whom I imparted it) as well as I. Go, hold close, and you will do a great service in it." *

Archbishop Ussher's opposition was slight, and soon withdrawn. It was of him that Strafford said, while resisting an appeal made to him on this occasion, "that he was so learned a prelate, and so good a man, that he hoped his opposition at this time would not be imputed to him." The Deputy remained firm, notwithstanding the clamours of the puritans. "I am not ignorant," he wrote to Laud, "that my stirring in this matter will be strangely reported and censured, and how I shall be able to sustain myself against your Prynnes, Pyms, and Bens, with the rest of that generation of odd names and natures, the Lord knows. Sure I am, I have gone herein with an upright heart to prevent a breach, apparent at least betwixt the Churches of England and Ireland."

The object of Laud, as has been said before, was to bring the three kingdoms, under the same sovereign, to observe the law as it then existed, evil as we should regard the constitution at that time, when looked upon with the eyes of those who live in the joy of that perfect liberty which secures his rights to the meanest man in the realm. On the same principle Laud in Scotland, and Strafford in Ireland, sought to enforce whatever had been enacted with the king's consent by the English Church. In Ireland the object was to confirm the Reformation, and in Strafford, Laud possessed a true and faithful friend. In Scotland Catholicism had to be restored, and in his labours to this end Laud was betrayed by one who was indebted to him very mainly for his high preferment, the Earl of Traquair.

Affairs in Scotland.

When the king had left Scotland, he had entertained good hopes of speedily accomplishing this object. Although

* Letter xci. Laud's Works, vi. pp. 396–97. Strafforde Letters, i. pp. 329 *seq.*

he unfortunately missed the opportunity of introducing the English Prayer Book, yet he had left directions for a Scottish Service Book to be compiled; he appointed a committee of Scottish bishops for the purpose, and directed them to correspond with Laud upon the subject. The Scottish bishops contended for a modification of the English Service Book.

The proposed Liturgy.

They represented that the jealousies of their nation would be in instant insurrection against a Service Book imposed by England, and that this danger might be avoided by such alterations as might give to the new Liturgy the semblance, at least, of a distinct compilation. Upon this, certain of the Scottish prelates were entrusted with the task of making a collection of canons, out of the existing constitutions of their own Church, and of effecting the requisite changes in the English ritual. And both canons and Liturgy, when completed, were to be submitted to the revisal of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of Juxon and Wren, the Bishops of London and Norwich, previously to their publication. With unaccountable precipitancy, the canons were published first; and this mode of proceeding, besides alarming the people with certain high doctrines relative to the king's prerogative and supremacy, and with the enactment of some ordinances, which were thought to savour too strongly of popery, disgusted the people by the absurdity of enjoining a strict observance of the Liturgy which was not yet completed, and which did not make its appearance till a considerable time afterwards. Another fatal inadvertency was, that these canons themselves were published without the consent or advice of any convocation of the Scottish clergy, and without any communication with the lords of the council.

The complexion of the archbishop's thoughts, and the tenor of his actions, relative to this critical and interesting

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

subject, may best be learned from his own History of his Troubles. That he was himself in correspondence with the Scottish bishops respecting certain projected alterations, he distinctly avows. That the intended canons were submitted to him for his consideration, he also confesses. Neither does he attempt to disguise that he assisted, by way of revisal, in the preparation of the Service Book. But he positively affirms that he never obtruded himself into these offices. On the contrary, he avers that he acted throughout under the express injunction of the king; and that with respect to the Liturgy, he acted most reluctantly. He declares that from the beginning it was his own wish to introduce the ritual of England without the slightest alteration. Finding, however, that this would hardly be endured, he was anxious to decline all further concern in the business; but being commanded to take a share in the work, he gave his best attention to make it as perfect as might be. It is likewise true that he openly gloried in the design, although it was not precisely such as he could have desired, and deeply regretted its ill success. "I will never deny," he exclaims, "the joy, while I live, which I conceived of the Church of Scotland's coming nearer, both in the canons and the Liturgy, to the Church of England. But the gross unthankfulness both to our God and our king, and our other many and great sins, have hindered this great blessing. And I pray God that the loss of this, which was almost effected, do not, in a short time, prove one of the greatest scourges that ever befell *this* kingdom, and *that* too." Again: "The worst thought I had of any Reformed Church in Christendom was to wish it like the Church of England, and so much better as it should please God to make it. And I hope that this was neither to negotiate with Rome, nor to reduce them to heresy in doctrine, nor to superstition and idolatry in worship; no, nor to tyranny in government;

Laud's desire to introduce the English ritual.

all which are most wrongfully imputed to me. And the comparing of me to the pope himself I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against popish superstition *than any presbyter of Scotland hath done.* And for my part, I could be content to lay down my life to-morrow, upon condition that the pope and Church of Rome would admit and confirm the Service Book, which hath been here so eagerly charged against me. For were that done, it would give a greater blow to popery (which is the corruption of the Church of Rome), than any that hath yet been given, and that they know full well. The Reformed Churches had need look well to themselves. For if they come out of Babel to run down to Egypt, they'll get but little by the bargain."

Variations from the English Prayer Book in the Scotch Liturgy.

Among many other variations from the English Prayer Book in the Scotch Liturgy, the word "presbyter" was generally substituted for "priest,"—a title offensive to the Scotch novelists. In the office for Public Baptism, the words "Sanctify this fountain, Thou which art the Sanctifier of all things," were added; and in the rubric it was ordered that the water in the font was to be changed twice a month at least, when those words were to be pronounced. The office for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist was considerably altered: an addition was made to the prayer for the church militant: the collect of humble access was placed after the prayer of oblation, the latter of which began "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same;" and ended with

CHAP. XXXVI. William Laud. 1633–45.

the words of the first collect in the post-communion of the Common Prayer Book. In the rubric the presbyter was not directed to stand at any particular part of the Holy table, but "at such a part, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands;" and, with regard to the offertory, the Scotch rubric assigned one half to the presbyter for providing him books of divinity, the other half to furnishing the church, or relieving the poor.

The Scotch Liturgy was approved by Archbishop Laud, and authorised by the king in a proclamation to his "lovits, messengers, and sheriffs in that part."*

Riots in Scotland on the use of the Liturgy.

The burst of fury with which the book was received in Edinburgh was terrible. Peers, ministers, and "godly matrons" vied with each other in stirring up the people. The Seventh Sunday after Trinity in that year is known as the "Stony Sabbath," or the "Casting of the Stools;" for stones and stools were hurled at the heads of such of the clergy as ventured to read the service. Bishop Lindsay was attacked by the mob, and being very stout and unable to defend himself, or get away from his assailants, was well-nigh immolated. In other parts of Scotland, though such open violence was not resorted to, the resistance to the use of the Liturgy was stern and stubborn.

It was evident that the people were not to be coerced into using a form of prayer which they disliked, or rather which they were taught to resist. The king was very irate when he heard of the riot at Edinburgh, declaring that sufficient firmness had not been shewn; and Laud wrote to the Earl of Traquiar, stating that his majesty expected that his lordship, and the rest of the honourable council would set themselves to it, that the Liturgy might

* The proclamation was dated Dec. 20, 1636. The Liturgy was appointed to be read in the churches in July, 1637.

be established orderly and with peace, to repair what had been done amiss.* The consequence was rebellion.

The ultimate result of that attempt, says Mr. Le Bas, was that episcopacy was laid in the dust; that the solemn league and covenant was substituted for the oath of allegiance, and became the guide, or the tyrant, of every conscience throughout Scotland; and that the people ran to subscribe it, some to escape proscription, and others as if they were writing their names in the book of life. It had been asserted by Prynne, in England, that Christ was a *puritan*: and the anti-prelatists, in Scotland, discovered that Christ was a *covenanter*. The covenant, in short, was Christ's marriage contract. They who refused to subscribe it were no better than atheists. And as for the prelates, the wrath of God would never leave the kingdom till they were all hanged up before the Lord! The issue of all this fanaticism was, that the power of the crown was made to bow before that dominion in which kings and nobles were "God's silly vassals," and the Presbyterian sect was raised up in such glory, that she was vaunted to be "fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners."

It was in March 1638, that this solemn league was first subscribed, after having been read aloud to an enthusiastic multitude in Grey Friars church, Edinburgh. Although it was not till the year 1643 that it was established to form a bond of union between the Scottish and the English Presbyterians, yet the promoters of it were already busily employed throughout the two kingdoms to obtain subscriptions to it. It was prepared by Henderson, who was supported by those noblemen in Scotland, who, having enriched themselves by the spoils of the Church, were unwilling to give up any portion of their ill-gotten wealth.

* Clar., i. 177. Collyer, viii. p. 112. Lawson's Episc. Church of Scotland, p. 499. Laud's letters, cxlii.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Archbishop Laud, in his diary,* shews that he was regarding the state of public affairs with considerable alarm, and with some personal fear. "The tumult," he says, "in Scotland about the Service Book offered to be brought in, began July 3, 1637, and continued increasing by fits; and has now brought that kingdom in danger. No question but there is a great concurrence between them and the puritan party in England. A great aim there, to destroy me in the king's opinion." This observation is the more remarkable, as on the surface of things there was at this time a profound peace,—a calm preceding the storm.

We must now return to the proceedings of the Lord Primate in England.

Collections for the ministers of the Palatinate.

The Queen of Bohemia, the king's sister, had urged the king to permit a public collection to be made for the ministers of the Palatinate. Laud acceded cordially, and his majesty granted his letters patent for the collection to be made in all parts of the kingdom. But when these letters were brought to the archbishop, he objected strongly to some of the expressions therein contained. The ministers of the Palatinate were described as being of the same church as the Church of England, which Laud positively denied; and the government of the Church of Rome was called an antichristian yoke. Laud could not approve these assumptions; for first, he said, he knew full well that by the religion of those churches all the Calvinian rigours, in the point of predestination, and the rest depending thereupon, were received as orthodox; and that they maintained a parity of ministers, directly contrary both to the doctrine and government of the Church of England. This proved that the doctrine of those churches was not altogether the

* April 29, 1638.

same as that of the English Church, and he conceived that it would be very unsafe that his majesty should declare under the Great Seal of England, that both himself and all his subjects were bound in conscience to maintain the religion of those churches with their utmost power. And secondly, with regard to the other point, there was a great controversy. Protestant divines were not agreed upon the matter, nor had it been defined by the Church of England; therefore, definitely to declare, by letters patent under the Great Seal of England, that the pope was antichrist, and the papists antichristian, would be a most grievous mistake, and an act of unjustifiable intolerance.

The king perceived the truth of Laud's objections, and gave order that the letters patent should be cancelled, and new ones drawn up, the objectionable clauses being expunged.*

Visit of the Prince Elector of the alatinate.

While the collection was being made, Charles Ludovic, the Prince Elector of the Palatinate,† and the eldest surviving son of the Queen of Bohemia, came to England to visit his uncle Charles, and to desire his aid and counsel for the recovery of the electoral dignity and estate, which of right belonged to him. The king welcomed him graciously, and assigned to him the rooms at Whitehall which were known as the quarters of the Prince of Wales, where he lodged except when he attended the king in his summer progress. He was not in England long before he sought out Laud, between whom and his mother, the Queen of Bohemia, there had been a friendly correspondence. On St. Andrew's Day Laud wrote in his diary, "Charles, Prince Elector Palatine, was with me at Lambeth and at solemn evening prayer." A few days after there is another entry in the diary: "Charles, Prince

* Cyp. Ang., p. 288.

† Charles Lewis, the eldest surviving son of Frederic, Elector Palatine, and Elizabeth, King Charles's sister.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

His church principles.

Elector, came suddenly upon me and dined with me at Lambeth." The prince evidently accepted the doctrines of the Church of England, for he not only diligently attended the morning and evening services in his majesty's chapel, but he also joined in the Holy Communion. "On Christmas Day," writes Laud, "Charles, Prince Elector, received the Communion with the king at Whitehall. Kneeled a little beside on his left hand. He sat before the Communion upon a stool by the wall before the traverse, and had another stool and a cushion to kneel at."*

His books.

The prince while in England wrote two books or pamphlets; the one under the name of a "*Protestation*," was, as the title implies, a protest against the violent proceedings in opposition to his interests and his family,—the other, to which he gave the name, the "*Manifest*," was a dissertation upon the right of his succession in the lands and dignities, of which his father had been unjustly dispossessed by the Emperor Ferdinand II. These writings in themselves would have no bearing upon the history of Laud and his times, were it not that in them Laud's influence may be perceived. While the prince laboured to advance his interests in the recovery of his patrimony and estates in Germany, he no less laboured to preserve the interests of the Church of England from all dangers and disturbances which might come from thence. A book was written in opposition, intituled "A Declaration of the Faith and Ceremonies of the Palsgrave's Churches;" and of this Heylyn says, "The prince was welcome, but the book might better have stayed at home, brought hither in Dutch and here translated into English, printed and exposed to the public view, to let the vulgar reader see how much we wanted of the purity and simplicity of the Palatine churches."†

* Diary, Nov. 21, 30, Dec. 25, 1635.

† Cyp. Ang., pp. 289–90. The book was scurrilous, and was suppressed.

The queen, who had always disliked Laud for his strictness, took him now for a short time into her favour. He had transacted some business for her to her satisfaction, and she promised to be his friend, giving him immediate access to her presence whenever he had occasion. But the favour of the fickle queen did not last long, as the archbishop gave her great offence by remonstrating with the king on the increase of the Romish party, and especially for the conduct of those who were doing what mischief they could against the Church of England in Denmark House. "She was highly displeased with me," says the archbishop, "and so continues."

Laud's relations with the Queen.

It must have been very much against his will and only at the express desire of the king, that Laud accepted the commission of the Treasure. He knew that by reason of the prevalence of puritanism he was unpopular with the people, and by becoming Lord Treasurer he was aware that he would create a faction against himself in the Court. And so it was. Lord Cottington, Chancellor of the Exchequer, began to look upon him with envy, and to oppose him; and to Laud's great sorrow his old friend Mr. Secretary Windebank joined in the opposition. He continued, however, in office, a full year, to make himself master of the real position of affairs, and he discovered that the post of Lord Treasurer was worth 7,000*l.* a year, without defrauding the king or abusing the subject. There had, therefore, he argued, been some fraud on the part of previous Lord Treasurers, who from very mean and private fortunes, had raised themselves to the titles and estates of earls. Some of the greatest of the nobility had fixed their eyes upon what they thought the great prize of the Court; but Laud was fully determined not to commend anyone to the king to be appointed the next Lord Treasurer, but such a one as having no family to raise, no wife and children to provide for, might better manage the

Laud, appointed Lord Treasurer, retains office for one year.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Juxon succeeds him.

income of the treasury to the king's advantage than had been formerly the case. He knew the most fitting man for the office. Already had he procured the bishopric of London, when vacated by himself, for his old and trusty friend Dr. Juxon, and now he recommended the bishop for the office of Lord Treasurer. If regard were had simply to the advantage of the king, a better appointment, as was universally admitted by friend and by foe, could not have been made. But the indignation of the disappointed courtiers was very great. That which was an objection to the appointment in other men's minds, was a recommendation to the archbishop. In his diary on Sunday, March 6, he says: "William Juxon, Lord Bishop of London, made Lord High Treasurer of England. No churchman had it since Henry VII.'s time. I pray God bless him to manage it so that the Church may have honour and the king and the state service and contentment by it. And now if the Church will not hold up themselves I can do no more."

On the first day of the term following his appointment, Juxon was conducted in great state from London House to Westminster Hall, the Archbishop of Canterbury riding with him; while most of the lords and bishops about town, and many gentlemen of chief note and quality followed by two and two to "make up the pomp." Many persons expected, and some hoped that the treasurer would sink under the burden of his position and duties; but, on the contrary, he managed everything well, and with such an even and steady hand, that all applauded and few envied his preferment. Lord Falkland, after one of his bitter speeches against the bishops, could only say of Juxon, "that in an unexpected place and power he expressed an equal moderation and humility, being neither ambitious before nor proud after, either of the crozier or the white staff."*

* Cyp. Ang., p. 286.

While the archbishop was thus advising the king as he thought best on matters of state, he was no less diligent in striving to do good to his friends, and to keep them in the right way. We have two letters written at this time—the one intended to restrain Calvinistic teaching, the other to recall one who had embraced the errors of Romanism to the Church of England—both of which are very interesting. Addressing the Bishop of Winchester, as visitor of New College, Oxford, the archbishop writes: "I have often wondered why so many good scholars came from Winchester to New College, and yet so few of them afterwards prove eminent men: and while I lived in Oxford I thought upon divers things that might be the causes of it, and I believe true ones. But I have lately heard of another which I think hath done and doth the college a great deal of harm in the breeding of their young men. When they come from Winchester they are to be probationers two years and then fellows. A man would think those two years and some years after should be allowed to logic, philosophy, mathematics, and the like grounds of learning, the better to enable them to study divinity with judgment. But I am of late accidentally come to know that when the probationers stand for their fellowships and are to be examined how they have profited, one chief thing in which they are examined is how diligently they have read Calvin's Institutions, and are more strictly held to it how they have profited in that than almost in any kind of learning besides. I do not deny but that Calvin's Institutions may be profitably read, and as one of their first books of divinity, when they are well grounded in other learning, but to begin with it so soon I am afraid doth not only hinder them from all grounds of judicious learning, but also too much possess their judgments before they are able to judge, and makes many of them humorous in, if

Laud's endeavours for the good of the Church of England.

Letter about New College.

CHAP. XXXVI. William Laud. 1633-45.

not against the Church. For so many of them have proved in this latter age, since my own memory in that university." *

The archbishop, therefore, requested the Bishop of Winchester, as visitor, to take counsel with the warden of New College, whom he describes as a learned and discreet man, as to devising a remedy. At the same time he urged his lordship to be cautious, and wait till a good opportunity presented itself, and he desired that it should not be made known from whom the information came; because if it was noised abroad that the archbishop had desired a change, the matter would be raised from a college to a university question, and a contest between the puritans and churchmen would inevitably ensue, which would be fatal to any reformation.

Letter to Sir K. Digby.

The other letter referred to was to Sir Kenelm Digby, who to Laud's great grief had become a Romanist. Digby wrote to the archbishop on the occasion of his perversion, and received a long and exhaustive reply. "I am sorry," says Laud, "for all the contents of your letter, save that which expresses your love to me." It appears that the archbishop had written to Sir Kenelm more than once before, but had received no answer. A gentle rebuke is given by Laud to Sir Kenelm. "Had my letters miscarried," he wrote, "I should have held it a great misfortune." He proceeds: "I thank you, and take it for a great testimony of your love to me, that you have been pleased to give me so open and clear account of your proceedings with yourself in this matter of religion. In which, as I cannot but commend the strict reckoning to which you have called yourself, so I could have wished, before you had absolutely settled the foot of that account, you would have called in some friend, and made use of his eye as a bystander, who oftentimes sees more than

* Letter, Feb. 2, 1635. Works, v. 117.

he that plays the game. You write, I confess, that after you had fallen upon these troublesome thoughts, you were nigh two years in the diligent discussion of the matter, and that you omitted no industry, either of conversing with learned men, or of reading the best authors, to beget in you a right intelligence of this subject. I believe all this, and you did wisely to do it. But I have some questions, out of the freedom of a friend, to ask about it. Were not all the learned men you conversed with, for this particular, of the Roman party? Were not the best authors you mention of the same side? If both men and authors were the same way, can they beget any righter intelligence in you than is in themselves? If they were men and authors on both sides with whom you conversed, why was I (whom you are pleased to style one of your best friends) omitted? True, it may be, you could not reckon me among those learned men and able for direction, with whom you conversed: suppose that; yet yourself accounts me among your friends. And is it not many times as useful, when thoughts are distracted, to make use of the freedom and openness of a friend not altogether ignorant, as of those which are thought more learned, but not so free, nor perhaps so indifferent?

"But the result, you say, that first began to settle you was, that you discerned by this your diligent conversation and studious reading, that there were great mistakings on both sides, and that passion and affection to a party transported too many of those that entered into the lists in this quarrel. Suppose this also to be true, I am heartily sorry, and have been ever since I was of any understanding in matters of religion, to hear of sides in the Church. And I make no doubt but it will one day fall heavy upon all that wilfully make, or purposely continue sidings in that body. But when sides are made and

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

continued, remember you confess there are great mistakings on both sides. And how then can you go from one side to the other, but you must go from one mistaking to another? And if so, then by changing the side, you do but change the mistaking, not quit yourself from mistakes. And if you do quit yourself from them, by God's goodness and your own strength, yet why might not that have been done without changing the side, since mistakes are on both sides? As for the passion and transportation of many that enter the lists of this quarrel, I am sure you mean not to make their passion your guide, for that would make you mistake indeed. And why then should their passion work upon your judgment? especially since the passion as well as the mistakes are confessed to be on both sides.

"After this follows the main part of your letter, and that which principally resolved you to enter again the communion of the Church of Rome, in which you had been born and bred, against that semblance of good reason which formerly had made you adhere to the Church of England.

"And first, you say you now perceive that you may preserve yourself in that Church, without having your belief bound up in several particulars, the dislike whereof had been a motive to you to free yourself from the jurisdiction which you conceived did impose them. It is true all Churches have some particulars free. But doth that Church leave you free to believe or not believe anything determined in it? And did not your former dislike arise from some things determined in and by that Church? And if so, what freedom see you now that you saw not then? And you cannot well say that your dislike arose from anything not determined; for in those the jurisdiction of that Church imposes not.

"You add that your greatest difficulties were solved,

when you could distinguish between the opinions of some new men raised upon wrested inferences, and the plain and solid articles of faith delivered at the first. Why, but I cannot but be confident you could distinguish these long since, and long before you joined yourself to the Church of England. And that therefore your greatest difficulties (if these were they) were as fully and fairly solved then as now they are, or can be. Besides, if by these plain and solid articles, you mean none but the Creed (and certainly no other were delivered at the first), you seem to intimate, by comparing this and the former passage, that so you believe these plain and first articles, you may preserve yourself in that Church from having your belief bound up to other particulars, which I think few will believe beside yourself, if you can believe it. And the opinions of new men, and the wrested inferences upon these, are some of those great mistakes which you say are on both sides, and therefore needed not to have caused your change.

"To these first articles you say the Church in no succeeding age hath power to add (as such) the least tittle of new doctrine. Be it so, and I believe it heartily (not as such), especially if you mean the articles of the Creed. But yet if that Church do maintain that all her decisions in a General Council are articles *Fidei Catholicæ*, and that all Christians are bound to believe all and every one of them, *eâdem fide, quâ Fidei articulos;* and that he is an heretic which believes them not all; where is then your freedom, or your not being bound up in several particulars? And if you reply you dislike no determination which that Church hath made, then why did you formerly leave it, to free yourself from that jurisdiction that you conceived imposed them? For if the things which troubled you were particulars not determined, they were not imposed upon your belief. And if they were deter-

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

mined, and so imposed, how are you now set free more than then?

"You say again, you see now that to be a Catholic doth not deprive them of the forenamed liberty, who have abilities to examine the things you formerly stuck at, and drive them up to their first principles. But first then what shall become of their liberty who are not able to examine? Shall they enthrall their consciences? Next, what shall secure them who think themselves, and are perhaps thought by others, able to examine, yet indeed are not? Thirdly, what assurance is there in cases not demonstrable (as few things in religion are), that they which are able to examine, have either no affection to blind their judgment, or may not mistake themselves and their way in driving a doubtful point to its first principles? Lastly, how much doth this differ from leaning upon a private spirit, so much cried out against by that side, when men, under pretence of their ability, shall examine the tenets of the Church, and assume a liberty to themselves under colour of not being bound?

"But you say this is not the breaking of any obligation that the Church lays upon you; but only an exact understanding of the just and utmost obligations that side ties men to. I must here question again. For first, what shall become of their freedom that cannot reach to this exact understanding? And next, do not you make yourself as a private man judge of the Church's obligations upon you? And is it not as great an usurpation upon the Church's power and right to be judge of her obligations as of her tenets? For if the points be left free, there is no obligation, nor can you, or need any other have any scruple. But if the points be binding by the predetermination of the Church, can you any way be judge of her obligation, but you must be judge also of the point to which she obliges? Now, I think that the Church will

hardly give liberty to any private man to be so far her judge, since she scarce allows so much to any as *judicium discretionis* in things determined by her.

"These utmost obligations to which that side ties men, you believe many men (and not of the meanest note) pass over in gross, without ever thoroughly entering into the due consideration thereof. And truly I believe so too, that among too many men on both sides neither the points nor the obligations to them are weighed as they ought. But that is no warrant (pardon my freedom) that yourself hath considered them in all circumstances, or that you have considered them better now than you did before, when the dislike of that imposing jurisdiction was your first motive to free yourself from it by joining to the Church of England.

"And whereas you say, that you have returned into that communion, who from your birth had right of possession in you, and therefore ought to continue it, unless clear and evident proof (which you say surely cannot be found) should have evicted you from it: truly, sir, I think this had been spoken with more advantage to you and your cause, before your adhering to the Church of England than now; for then right of possession could not have been thought little. But now, since you deserted that communion, either you did it upon clear and evident proof, or upon apparent only. If you did it then upon clear and evident proof, why say you now no such can be found? If you did it but upon apparent and seeming proof, (a semblance of very good reason as yourself calls it,) why did you then come off from that communion, till your proof were clear and evident? And why may not that, which now seems clear and evident, be but apparent, as well as that, which then seemed clear unto you, be but semblance now? Nor would I have you say, that clear and evident proof cannot be found for a man, in

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

this case of religion, to forego the communion which had right of possession in him from his birth, for the proposition is an universal negative, and of hard proof. And therefore, though I think I know you and your judgment so well, that I may not without manifest wrong charge you, that you did in this great action, and so nearly concerning you, *ad pauca respicere*, which our great master tells us breeds facile and easy, rather than safe and warrantable determinations, yet it will be upon you not only in honour without, but also in conscience within, to be able to assure yourself that you did *ad plurima*, if not *ad omnia respicere*.

"The thing being so weighty in itself, and the miserable division of Christendom (never sufficiently to be lamented) making the doubt so great, that you, who have been on both sides, whether this last act of yours be not in you rather a relapse into a former sickness than a recovery from a former fall.

"But against this, the temper of your mind (you say) arms you against all censures, no slight air of reputation being able to move you. In this, I must needs say, you are happy: for he that can be moved from himself by the changeable breath of men, lives more out of than in himself, and (which is a misery beyond all expression) must in all doubts go to other men for resolution; not to himself, as if he had no soul within him. But yet, *post conscientiam fama*. And though I would not desire to live by reputation; yet would I leave no good means untried, rather than live without it. And how far you have brought yourself in question, which of these two, conscience or reputation, you have shaken by this double change, I leave yourself to judge; because you say your first was with a semblance of very good reason. And though you say again, that it now appears you were then misled, yet you will have much ado to make the world think so.

"The way you took in concealing this your resolution of returning into that communion, and the reasons which you give why you so privately carried it here, I cannot but approve. They are full of all ingenuity, tender and civil respects, fitted to avoid discontent in your friends, and scandal that might be taken by others, or contumely that might be returned upon yourself. And as are these reasons, so is the whole frame of your letter (setting aside that I cannot concur in judgment) full of discretion and temper, and so like yourself that I cannot but love even that which I dislike in it. And though I shall never be other than I have been to the worth of Sir Kenelm Digby, yet most heartily sorry I am that a man whose discourse did so much content me should thus slide away from me, before I had so much as suspicion to awaken me and suggest that he was going. Had you put me into a dispensation, and communicated your thoughts to me before they had grown up into resolutions, I am a priest, and would have put on what secresy you should have commanded. A little knowledge I have, (God knows, a little,) I would have ventured it with you in that serious debate you have had with yourself. I have ever honoured you, since I knew your worth, and I would have done all offices of a friend to keep you nearer than now you are. But since you are gone, and settled another way, before you would let me know it, I know not now what to say to a man of judgment, and so resolved: for to what end should I treat, when a resolution is set already? So set, as that you say no clear and evident proof can be found against it; nor can I tell how to press such a man as you to ring the changes in religion. In your power it was not to change; in mine it is not to make you change again. Therefore to the moderation of your own heart, under the grace of God, I must and do now leave you for matter of religion; but retaining still with me, and entirely, all the love and friendliness which

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

your worth won from me; well knowing, that all differences in opinion shake not the foundations of religion.

"Now to your postscript, and then I have done. That I am the first, and the only person to whom you have written thus freely, I thank you heartily for it. For I cannot conceive anything thereby, but your great respect to me, which hath abundantly spread itself all over your letter. And had you written this to me, with a restraint of making it further known, I should have performed that trust; but since you have submitted it to me what further knowledge of it I shall think fit to give to any other person, I have, as I took myself bound, acquainted his majesty with it, who gave a great deal of very good expression concerning you, and is not a little sorry to lose the service of so able a subject. I have likewise made it known in private to Mr. Secretary Cook, who was as confident of you as myself. I could hardly believe your own letters, and he as hardly my relation. To my secretary I must needs trust it, having not time to write it again out of my scribbled copy; but I dare trust the secresy in which I have bound him. To others I am silent, and shall so continue, till the thing open itself, and I shall do it out of reasons very like to those which you give, why yourself would not divulge it here. In the last place, you promise yourself that the condition you are in will not hinder me from continuing to be the best friend you have. To this I can say no more, than that I could never arrogate to myself to be your best friend, but a poor, yet respective friend of yours I have been ever since I knew you: and it is not your change that can change me, who never yet left but where I was first forsaken; and not always there. So praying for God's blessing upon you, and in that way which he knows most necessary for you, I rest, your very loving friend to serve you, *in Domino*." *

* Letter cxviii., dated March 27, 1636.

This letter is given *in extenso*, because it proves that, though harassed by his multifarious duties, Laud was ready to give his time, his pen, and his thoughts for the sake of upholding the doctrines of the Church of England against those of Rome, and of recalling a friend from his error. That the writer of this letter should have been condemned for a tendency to Romanism is, indeed, a matter strange though true.

Right of Laud to visit the universities contested.

The archbishop, with zeal which even his enemies allowed was untiring, desired to set matters right in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. With this object in view he proposed to hold a visitation *jure metropolitico*; but his right to do so was contested. It was alleged by the universities that this jurisdiction was vested in the king, and in him only; and that the archbishop had no right to visit the said universities *jure metropolitico*, and an appeal was made to the council board. There it was decided that it was the undoubted right of the Crown to visit the universities whensoever his majesty pleased;* and that the archbishop, in right of his metropolitical church of Canterbury, had power to visit his whole province, which contained the universities; and this power he might exercise, unless they could show privilege or exemption. According to the law of the land they could not be exempted by any papal bull, nor could they plead any of their charters. That the visitation of the archbishop was an innovation could not be admitted, for it appeared that both universities had actually been visited by three of Laud's predecessors, *jure metropolitico*, and not by any legatine power. Moreover the case of the archbishop was substantiated by the fact that in the reign of Richard II., and also in the reign of Henry IV., the matter had been argued, adjudged, and affirmed. The act of

* *See* Secretary Cook's speech, Hist. of Chancellorship, pp. 126, *seq.*

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

parliament* was quoted by Laud, as under the Great Seal of Henry IV.; and he also produced before his majesty the original renunciation of all privileges from any pope, by the University of Cambridge, under the hands of the heads of the houses there. It was therefore declared and adjudged by the king, with the advice of his council, that the right of visiting both the universities, as universities, and the chancellors, scholars, and others, enjoying the privilege of the said universities, "doth belong to the archbishop and metropolitical church of Canterbury, by themselves or commis aries, and that they shall be from time to time obedient thereunto." †

Given in Laud's favour.

The intended visitation of the universities was made, of course, a charge against Laud when on his trial, and his answers to his accusers were short but sufficient. "Against law," he says, "it cannot be, so long as it was with the king's knowledge and by his warrant. All was settled at a most full council table, and great counsel of law were heard on both sides." It was proved that his predecessors did actually visit the universities, and that *jure ecclesiæ suæ metropoliticæ*. And, lastly, no immunity was pleaded why the archbishop should not visit, for the instance against Cardinal Pole was nothing, for he attempted to visit not only by the right of his See, but by his power legatine from the pope; whereas the university charters are express that such power of visitation cannot be granted *per bullas papales*.

Laud was judged for his intention, and not for the fact of his holding a visitation of the universities, for this never was carried out. "My troubles," he says, "began then to be foreseen by me, and I visited them not." ‡

An event now occurred which was a bright spot in his

* 13 Hen. IV.

† Rushworth, ii. pp. 324 *seq.* Wilkins' Concilia, iv. pp. 525 *seq.*

‡ Troubles and Trial, Works, iv. p. 193.

life. From his love of the king, and of the university of Oxford, and especially of his own college, it was a great delight to the archbishop that he should hail a royal visit to the place of his education. Six days before the end of August 1636, Laud was at Oxford making preparations for a visit of the king and queen, who were to be entertained by him as chancellor of the university. As usual he was indefatigable in his work, and the royal visit passed off without hitch or hindrance. The royal party approached Oxford by the way of Woodstock, on the twenty-ninth day of August, and was met by the archbishop, the vice-chancellor, the heads of houses, and the doctors of the university. All the various ceremonies which were wont to attend the royal approach to a town were duly observed, including certain speeches by which their majesties were welcomed. The vice-chancellor spoke for the university authorities, the recorder of Oxford for the city magnates. At the gate of St. John's College, Mr. Thomas Atkinson,* a member of that community, delivered another speech, which was highly approved by the king.

The royal visit to Oxford.

Entry of the king.

The cavalcade proceeded through the chief streets, which were lined with scholars of all degrees; yet, says the historian, neither they nor the citizens made any expressions of joy, or uttered, as the manner is, "Vivat Rex." Arrived at the great gate at Christ Church, the university orator, William Strode, delivered a speech, which was couched in the highest terms of rhetoric, and was admired, as Wood says with a slight touch of irony, by all Christ Church men, the orator being a student and afterwards a canon of Christ Church.

The archbishop, as chancellor, in the name of the uni-

Presentations made by Laud.

* Atkinson had been ordained deacon by Laud; was proctor in 1629, and afterwards rector of South Warnborough; which he exchanged with Heylyn.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

versity, then presented to the king a Bible richly ornamented, and a costly pair of gloves; a pair of gloves also was offered to the queen. To Charles, Prince Elector Palatine, was given a copy of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, also with a pair of gloves; and to the prince's brother, the renowned Rupert, Cæsar's Commentaries in English, illustrated by the learned explanations and discourses of Sir Clement Edmonds.*

Attended by the chancellor and the nobles in his suite, the king proceeded to divine service in the cathedral, but before he entered he knelt down at the large south door, where, lifting up his hands and eyes, with his long left lock (according to the then mode) "shelving over his shoulder," he did his devotions. After divine service he retired to his lodgings, which were in Christ Church.

The different entertainments.

In the evening, supper being over, their majesties sat out a comedy given by the scholars. There was nothing particularly striking in the play, except that the manner of managing the scenery was novel, and a great deal of mechanical skill was displayed.† Strode, the public orator, was the author of the words, but he was not altogether successful in the "Passions Calmed, or the Settling of the Floating Island," for such was the title of the play, as it had "more of the moralist than poet in it, and though it was well penned, yet it did not take with the courtiers so well as it did with the togated crew."

Service and sermon in the cathedral.

The next day the king attended service in the cathe-

* Apart from the usual custom of presenting gloves, it will be remembered that Woodstock, near Oxford, was celebrated for the manufacture.

† "These representations, being the first that were used on the English stage, I have been," says Wood, "the more punctual in describing them, to the end that posterity might know, that what is now seen in the playhouses at London, is originally due to the invention of Oxford scholars." Annals, ii. pt. i. p. 409.

dral at eight o'clock, and listened to an eulogistic sermon by the senior proctor, on the text, "Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven and glory in the highest." It is evident from this sermon that the extraordinary misapplication or perversion of texts was not confined to the puritans, and we are astonished that men of learning and ability should have had the bad taste to lower the words of Scripture relating to our Lord himself, to the eulogy of their temporal king.

A convocation held; and degrees conferred.

The sermon over, a convocation was held, in which honorary degrees were conferred on the illustrious visitors, and Laud, as chancellor, made a short speech in Latin, which is given *in extenso* in the history of his chancellorship of Oxford. The royal party having visited the Public Library, where the king viewed the new buildings and the books,* proceeded to St. John's College, where Laud showed with satisfaction the work that had been done under his auspices and at his expense. The archbishop entertained his sovereign and his other illustrious guests with great magnificence in his own college, and with his grace the royal party dined in the new library built by himself. The way in which Laud entered into all the details of the entertainments he provided, shews that, however stern and strict by nature, he could at times unbend. "I thank God," he says, "I had that happiness that all things were in very good order, and that no man went out at the gates, courtier or other, but content, which was a happiness quite beyond expectation."

A play was acted before their majesties at St. John's by the scholars of that institution, and yet another play

* The part of the Library over the Convocation-house was appropriated to the reception of the MSS. given by the Earl of Pembroke, Sir K. Digby, and the archbishop, and ultimately of Sheldon's library, which latter still remains in its original position.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

was performed in the evening in the hall of Christ Church, the taste of the queen being studiously consulted. So much pleased was her majesty with one of the representations, that she requested that the apparel used might be lent to her own players in London. Laud only stipulated that neither the play, nor clothes, nor stage, might come into the hands and use of the common players abroad.

Everything passed off well in this royal visit to Oxford, and we have an expression of Laud which shews his exultation at this time. "It was," he said, "the day of St. Felix, and all went happily."*

But there were not many such "bright spots" in store for him, for from the year 1637 date the troubles of the archbishop—we may say, indeed, of the king himself. Laud's incapacity to discover the signs of the times, his determination to uphold the old constitution, when, if at any time in our history, radical reforms were most required, made him a very unfit counsellor for the king, who, however much insulted, thought that he had only to exert his will and to confound those who, being opposed to that will, he regarded as rebels.

State of the country.

Apparently, the country was in a flourishing condition; the realm was at peace; the court was virtuous; the universities were flourishing; and by the exertions of those whom we now call the Caroline divines, the learning of the clergy was never surpassed, and the condition of the poorer members of that body was in a state of improvement. Those at the head of affairs could not be ignorant of the deep-rooted hostility which was growing up between the people and the king, but the people were contemned, except by certain patriots, who would no longer submit to the rule of a single person, such as had hitherto been the case. They were patriots,

* Hist. of Chancellorship, Works, v. pp. 148 *seq.* Wood's Annals, ii. pt. i. pp. 407 *seq.*

and we sympathise with them most cordially in the object they had at heart, but it is scarcely possible to approve of the means they adopted for the furtherance of their end. Small as the army was, it was under the command of the king, and against that power it was necessary that the patriots should themselves be strongly armed. They, therefore, threw themselves into the arms of religious fanatics, until some of them, though at first asserting their allegiance to the Church of England, became themselves inebriated by that fanaticism which drove the country into madness.

The celebrated philosopher, Bishop Butler, observed on one occasion that there is no reason why madness should not be predicated of a multitude quite as much as of an individual. The feeling of the uneducated against the Church of England had now become an enthusiasm, and many persons were emigrating to the American colonies. With this emigration the government unwisely interfered; and by those of the emigrants who established their position in America a tyranny was soon after exercised, to the extent of which no coercion in the mother country had hitherto reached. It is said that some persons of the upper and better educated classes would have expatriated themselves if permission had been given for them to do so. Oliver Cromwell is affirmed to have contemplated emigration. His powerful mind may, indeed, have been ambitious to domineer over the minds of others, even on a smaller scale than that which was offered to him in the mother country. But it is scarcely probable that he seriously entertained such a measure as this.

The archbishop, in 1637, we may note in passing, had the pleasure of seeing accomplished another important work, and "A book containing the records which are in the Tower, and concerning the clergy," was transcribed

CHAP. XXXVI. William Laud. 1633–45.

on vellum at his sole charge, and deposited in the library at Lambeth.

Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton.

We have already mentioned the case of Mr. Prynne. He was again, with Bastwick and Burton, summoned before the Star Chamber for gross libel. This John Bastwick was born at Writtle in Essex, and was educated for a short time at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he did not take his degree. At Padua, however, he was styled by the title of doctor in medicine, and having travelled nine years on the Continent, he returned to England, settled to practice at Colchester, and instantly indulged in polemics. He wrote a book entitled, "*Flagellum pontificis et episcoporum Latialium.*" Fuller observes that his pen commanded a pure and fluent style, but as the learned editor of Fuller's works remarks, "Our honest historian is laughing in his sleeve."* Henry Burton had been schoolmaster or tutor to the sons of Lord Cary, afterwards Earl of Monmouth. Lady Cary was governess to King Charles, when Prince of Wales, and Burton had been recommended to the prince to attend him on his Spanish journey. But for some reason or another, probably on account of his insufficiency for the position, Burton was at the last moment left behind. This affront, as he deemed it perhaps rightly, rankled in his mind, and he commenced a war against authorities and powers, whether kings, princes, or bishops. He preached a sermon notable chiefly for the abuse which in a sermon could be contained, on the words, "My son, fear thou the Lord and the king, and meddle not with those that are given to change."† It was for this sermon, followed by another

* Brewer's note. Fuller, Book xi., sect. vii., par. 58. "A tolerable specimen of this purity will be found in his letter to Mr. Aquila Wycks, Keeper of the Gatehouse, in Nalson's Coll., i. p. 500."

† Prov. xxiv. 21. Burton stated that he had the degree of M.A. in the University of Cambridge. He wrote his own life, under the title, "A

in the same strain, that he was arraigned before the Star Chamber. Prynne spoke of the learned and munificent, as well as pious archbishop, as the "arch-agent for the devil;" he says that "Beelzebub himself had been archbishop," though he does not quote his authority for the fact; he terms the bishops generally, "Luciferian lords, execrable traitors, devouring wolves."

According to Bastwick, "The prelates are invaders of the king's prerogative royal, contemners and despisers of the Holy Scriptures, advancers of popery, superstition, idolatry, and profaneness; also they abuse the king's authority to the oppression of his most loyal subjects, and therein exercise great cruelty, tyranny, and injustice; and in execution of those impious performances, they shew neither wit, honesty, nor temperance. Nor are they either servants of God or of the king, but of the devil, being enemies of God, and the king, and of every living thing that is good." "All which," adds Whitelocke, "he (Bastwick) is ready to maintain."

"I dare boldly maintain," saith this Medico-Mastix, "they (the bishops) are more disobedient and worse than the devils themselves, to say nothing in passion and perturbation. Of all creatures, bishops, priests, and deacons are most wicked, ungrateful, disobedient, and rebellious. The Lord Jesus saith, Bring those mine enemies to me hither, that I may slay them that would not that I should rule over them. If slaughter to a kingdom be the preservation of it, then the prelates are the maintainers of it, for of all creatures they are most rebellious and impious. Nay, I peremptorily affirm that the prelates are worse than the devil." They are "rook-catchers, soul murdering hirelings, atheists, a commonwealth of rats." "The truth is," says he, "they are God's rebels and enemies,

Narrative of the Life of Mr. Henry Burton, &c." London, 1643. Brewer says of this, "At the time of his writing, he was certainly mad."

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

both by the law of God and the land, to God and the king, and, like the giants of old, war against the clouds, and if to say so be a scandal, I will live and die in it." "To say nothing of the Bishop of London, who was put into his office with such supreme dignity and incomparable majesty as he seemed a great king or mighty emperor to be inaugurated and installed in some superlative monarchy, see the prelate of Canterbury, in his ordinary garb, riding from Croydon to Bagshot, with forty or fifty gentlemen well mounted attending upon him, two or three coaches, with four and six horses," &c. And in this style he proceeds in his railing, till he signs himself the virtuous and elect lady's "poor orator."

Burton, in his two sermons, assails the bishops, whom, instead of fathers he styles *step-fathers*, caterpillars instead of pillars, whose houses are haunted, and their episcopal chairs poisoned by the spirit that bears rule in the air. "They are," he says, "the limbs of the beast, even of Antichrist, taking his very courses to bear and beat down the Word of God, whereby men might be saved. Their fear is more towards an altar of their own invention, an image or crucifix, the sound and syllable of Jesus, than towards the Lord Christ. They are miscreants, traps and wiles of the dragon dogs; like flattering tales, new Babel-builders. Blind watchmen, dumb dogs, thieves, robbers of souls, false prophets, ravening wolves, factors for Antichrist, antichristian mushrumps." He then clamours about popery, which he flatly charges the bishops with attempting to introduce; he asserts that the spirit of Rome breathes in them; that they wish "to wheel about to their Roman mistress;" that they are confederated with "priests and Jesuits to rear up that religion." And therefore, in his Apology, which, being published at his leisure, makes his sedition or treason the more notorious, they are styled "jesuited polypragmatics, and sons of Belial." Dr. White,

Bishop of Ely, is charged with railing, perverting, and fighting against truth. The learned Montague, of Chichester, is "a tried champion of Rome, and devoted votary of the queen of heaven:" Wren of Norwich meets with no quarter from this puritan Rabshakeh; and, finally, he falls upon the archbishop, upon whom he bestows plentiful abuse, and declares "that he had a papal infallibility of spirit, whereby, as by a divine oracle, all questions in religion are finally determined." "These," says Heylyn, who quotes numerous other expressions, "are the principal flowers of rhetoric which grew in the garden of Henry Burton, sufficient,. without doubt, to show how sweet a champion he was likely to prove of the Church and gospel."

He reproached the prelates with substituting "at" for "*in* the name of Jesus every knee shall bow;" with reading the second service at the Communion table; with placing it altar-wise at the upper end of the chancel; and with having forged a new article of religion (the twenty-first), which they brought from Rome.

Intolerance of the party puritans.

In the days of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, persons who ventured thus to speak of the constituted authorities, would have been put to death. Papists had, when in power, executed Protestants, and Protestants had executed papists: and Scotch reformers, out of power, had recommended assassination. How the puritans and ultra-protestants in power were determined to act, their murder of Charles and of Laud, their king and their archbishop, would be sufficient to shew. But the principles of the puritans are more strongly marked in the laws they ordained for New England, where the intolerance of presbytery, the madness of the Anabaptists, and the extravagance of the Independents and Brownists reigned supreme. But they were in stern earnest, and their severity was not against religious errors, as they

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

deemed them, only, but also against social crime. Capital punishment was adjudged for adultery, perjury, and blasphemy. Those who lied, drank, or danced, were to be publicly whipped. Heavy fines were laid upon such as swore, or broke the Sabbath. At the same time, any Romish priest returning to the colony after banishment would be put to death.

Encouraged by the late archbishop.

The ultra-protestants within the Church were as intolerant as the dissenters. In a letter addressed by Archbishop Abbot, the head, it will be remembered, of what would now be styled the Evangelical party, to King James, "I have been too long silent," says the primate, "and am afraid, by my silence, I have neglected the duty of the place it hath pleased God to call me unto, and your majesty to place me in. Your majesty hath propounded a toleration of religion. I beseech you to take into your consideration what your act is, and what the consequence may be; by your act you labour to set up the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome, the whore of Babylon! And hereunto I add what you have done in sending the prince into Spain, without consent of your council, the privity and approbation of your people; and although you have a charge and interest in the prince, as son of your flesh, yet have the people a greater, as son of this kingdom, upon whom, next after your majesty, are their eyes fixed, and welfare depends, and so tenderly is his going apprehended, as, believe it, however his return may be safe, yet the drawers of him into this action, so dangerous to himself, so desperate to the kingdom, *will not pass away unquestioned, unpunished.* What dreadful consequences these things may draw afterwards, I beseech your majesty to consider; and, above all, lest by this toleration, and discountenancing of the true profession of the gospel, wherewith God hath blessed us, and this kingdom hath so long

flourished under it, your majesty do not draw upon this kingdom in general, and yourself in particular, God's heavy wrath and indignation."

It must be stated, that some persons have doubted whether Abbot really wrote this letter. But it so certainly expressed the opinions of the party of which he was the head, that it was believed to be his. Whether really his or not, it has historical importance.

Punishment of the libellers.

When such was the spirit of the age, we may readily believe, that the government considered itself as acting mildly when it subjected these men first to a fine, and then to the pillory and imprisonment; but a sentence to the pillory implied the amputation of their ears, and few things excite our feelings of indignant compassion so much as mutilation. Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton underwent their sentence with great fortitude. Archbishop Laud has had all the odium for the sentence passed upon these ultra-protestants; and Evangelicals, as well as Sectarians, have reprobated his memory as if he had been the proposer of it. This, however, is not true. He was merely a member of the court. He spoke on the occasion, but it was only in vindication of himself; he did not deliver an opinion in the court, and he did not openly coincide with the sentence, however just he may have privately thought it. He expressly says, in the last passage of his speech: "But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, *I shall forbear to censure them*, and leave them to God's mercy and the king's justice." But when the court had decided upon the sentence, we know Laud's opinion of the manner in which it was carried into effect. The fault of Charles's government was, that it was apt to do just enough to provoke and irritate, but not enough to silence and terrify the evildoer. When a course of conduct was decided upon, Laud was for pursuing it "thorough." And on this occasion, writing to Strafford, he says: "What

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

think you of 'thorough,' when there can be such slips in business of consequence? What say you to it, that Prynne and his fellows should be suffered to talk what they pleased, while they stood in the pillory, and win acclamations from the people?"

Prynne was publicly fêted by the corporation of Chester on his way to Carnarvon Castle, and all the three libellers were allowed to enjoy, in open day, the full honours of martyrdom which their party paid them. The puritans, when in power, were not so liberal to the king or the archbishop.*

Clarendon's remarks.

The remarks of Lord Clarendon on the sentence and punishment of these three men are very just. That they deserved, for their scurrility, exemplary punishment, every one allowed; "yet," he says, "when they were all sentenced, and for the execution of that sentence brought out to be punished as common and signal rogues, exposed upon scaffolds to have their ears cut off, and their faces and foreheads branded with hot irons (as the poorest and most mechanic malefactor used to be, when they were not able to redeem themselves by any fine for their trespasse, or to satisfy any damages for the scandals they had raised against the good name and reputation of others), men began no more to consider their manners, but the men; and every profession, with anger and indignation enough, thought their education, and degrees, and quality would have secured them from such infamous judgments, and treasured up wrath for the time to come." †

Williams summoned before the Star Chamber.

Rather more than a month after the trial of Prynne and his associates, Laud delivered a speech in the Star Chamber, on the trial of Williams, Lord Bishop of Lin-

* Rushworth, ii. pp. 380 *seq.* Laud's Works, iv. p. 105, vi. p. 34. Fuller, Book xi. sec. vii. 56. Laud says, "Prynne's ears appeared at the bar scarce touched, or but at the hem." Letter to Strafford, No. cccIvi

† Clar., i. p. 155.

coln—a man of consummate ability and (we must confess) of no great firmness of principle. At the same time we must admit that Laud did not exhibit on this occasion that generosity of spirit which might have been expected. He had done what he could to conciliate Williams, but having failed, he did not now hesitate to take part against him.

Williams was censured in the Star Chamber on the 11th of July, for tampering with and corrupting of witnesses in the king's cause: in other words, he was tried for revealing the king's secrets, on the information of Sir John Lambe and Dr. Sibthorpe; for scandalous language reflecting on the king and his ministers; and for refusing to pay the tax of ship-money, which had been levied to defray the expenses of the navy. This complaint had been lodged against him, in 1636, by the high-sheriff of Huntingdonshire.

The prosecution for revealing the king's secrets, contrary to his oath as a privy-councillor, had been commenced against Bishop Williams in 1627, but he had contrived to stop or delay the proceedings for ten years, by shifts and evasions. The attorney-general, fearing a defeat in the evidence, set aside this charge, and preferred a new bill against him for tampering with the king's witnesses, on which bill he was condemned.

His sentence.

Williams was convicted by the whole court, and the first mover of the sentence was Lord Cottington, who condemned him to pay a fine of 10,000*l.* to the king, to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king's pleasure, and to be suspended by the High Commission Court from all his offices, preferments, and functions. The sentence was carried out; and on the 24th of July the Bishop's goods were seized at his palace of Bugden, to the value of the fine.

Further proceedings.

Another information was laid against him in February 1638-9, for holding a correspondence with Lambert

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Osbaldistone, master of Westminster School, whose letters were found in his own house at Bugden, written by that individual to him in 1633, in which Archbishop Laud was grossly libelled, and styled "the little urchin," (alluding to the archbishop's diminutive stature,) "the little meddling Hocus Pocus." For this he was sentenced to pay 5,000*l.* more, and 3,000*l.* to the archbishop.

His pardon.

Upon the meeting of the Long Parliament in November 1640, Williams addressed a petition to his sovereign that he might be released, and receive his writ as a peer to sit in parliament: but, through the influence of Laud, and the Lord Keeper Finch, his request was refused. The Lords, however, again thought proper to exert their authority upon this occasion; for, about a fortnight afterward, they sent the usher of the black rod to the Lieutenant of the Tower to demand the Bishop of Lincoln, and the king not daring to oppose the measure, he was peaceably surrendered, and instantly took his seat in the upper house. His majesty, likewise, thought proper to be reconciled to him, and ordered all the minutes of the information and proceedings against him to be destroyed; not, as some have asserted, "that nothing might stand on record against him," but in order to screen Laud and the other judges from the parliamentary inquiry which was threatened by the leaders of the opposition. Such, however, was the amiable disposition of Bishop Williams, that no intreaties could induce him to prosecute his enemies, or even to lodge any complaint against them before the House.

Everyone has heard of the sophistry of Williams when the attainder of the Earl of Strafford was in agitation. He it was who persuaded the king to sign the warrant; otherwise Strafford had not suffered. "A king," said he to Charles, "has a public and a private conscience, and he might do that as a king for his public conscience,

which militated against his private conscience as a man." This is despicable casuistry, unworthy to proceed from the lips of any man, still more unworthy to come from a Christian bishop.

The charges against him.

With regard to the proceedings against this prelate in 1637, there seems certainly to have been a confederation against him, for Sir John Lambe, Dr. Sibthorpe, Allen, and Burden, who were witnesses against him, based their reports, with regard to his revealing the king's secrets, upon an after-dinner conversation with Williams; and because they afterwards "fell foul" of the bishop in regard of mulcting the puritans who would not conform, they made this accusation against him. A heavier charge against Williams, not mentioned by Fuller, was that, as Dean of Westminster, he had embezzled money belonging to the cathedral.* Four of the prebendaries of Westminster maintained this charge, but it was not really substantiated.

It was a great mistake on Laud's part, that he took any share in the prosecution of Bishop Williams, and his speech on the occasion, though very clever, and full of learned illustrations and references, did not point out any very heinous crime, as committed by the late Lord Keeper.† His profession of sorrow for Williams after his speech, seems also to be out of place. "For my Lord Bishop of Lincoln," he said, "truly I am heartily sorry to do that which I must do, both by reason he is of my own coat, and also by reason of the place he hath in former time sustained in this court amongst your lordships, and in this commonwealth, but I must not forbear

* Strafford's Letters, i. pp. 360, 511–16.

† Hacket's Life of Williams, ii. iii. *seq.* Rushworth, ii. p. 438. Cyp. Ang., p. 323. Fuller, Book xi., sec. vii. p. 76 *seq.* Laud's speech (corrected from the Ashmole MS.), Works, vi. p. 71. Rushworth's report is unfair.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

to do that which my conscience leads me to, and less I must not do, than for to discharge that as I ought to do."

Laud's temperament.

The fact is, as has before been proved, Laud was passionate and carried away by the impulse of the moment. This unfortunate trait in his character is mentioned by the royal historian. "He could not bear contradiction," he says, "in debate, even in the council where all men are equally free, with that patience and temper that was necessary, of which they who wished him not well took many advantages, and would therefore contradict him that he might be transported with some indecent passion, which upon a short recollection he was always sorry for, and would readily and heartily make acknowledgment. No man so willingly made unkind use of all these occasions as the Lord Cottington, who, being a master of temper and of the most profound dissimulation, knew too well how to lead him into a mistake, and then drive him into choler and then expose him upon the matter and the manner to the judgment of the company; and he chose to do this most when the king was present; and then he would dine with him." *

The metropolitical visitation had now been carried into all parts of England and Wales with good effect. The clamour which had been raised on account of the order for transposing the Communion table to the place where undoubtedly it should stand had ceased, men's passions had calmed, and their thoughts had come to some repose, when the injunction had been more seriously and thoughtfully considered than was at first the case. But the calm was only that which presages a storm, and the puritan leaders were in secret agitation amongst themselves and in connection with the Scotch presbyterians. Had the attempt to enfocre the Liturgy in Scotland not been per-

* Clar., i. p. 163.

sisted in, in all human probability the rebellion might have been avoided, for it was on account of the attitude of the Scotch people that war was proclaimed, and the puritans of England were quite ready, with this lead, to appeal to arms. Without such a lead, matters would probably have righted themselves, and though the parliament was determined to assert its rights, bloodshed might have been avoided. "As to the *outward appearance*," says Heylyn, "things were now in a better position;" and as this was the case, Laud, satisfied with the effects of the visitation in England, turned his attention to the Channel Islands. At the Reformation, Jersey, Guernsey, and the other islands had been placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester. But as the inhabitants were inclined to the Calvinistic preaching of Frenchmen, they were allowed by Queen Elizabeth, 1565, to settle their own ecclesiastical government. It was then arranged that a synod should be held every two or three years, attended by representatives from Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, and Sark, according to the order of their book of discipline, digested by Snape and Cartwright, the notorious heads of the Genevan faction in England at that time. In King James' time there was considerable disorder in the churches in the islands, and, urged by the governor, the inhabitants returned to the Church of England. When under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Coutances, the chief ecclesiastical officer in each island had the title of dean; and this has been continued to the present time—the dean being accountable for his administration to the Bishop of Winchester. The Liturgy was translated into French, and ordered to be read in the churches; and canons were drawn up for regulating the ministers and the people in their several duties.*

The visitation extended to Jersey and the Channel Islands.

Archbishop Laud persuaded the king to establish some

* 21 James I.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. [1633–45.

fellowships at the English universities for the education of the inhabitants of Jersey and Guernsey. It was a wise measure, for up to this time young men designed for the ministry from those islands were sent to Lausanne or Geneva, whence they returned confirmed Calvinists. Laud resolved, also, that the metropolitical visitation should be held in each of the islands, and that it might be carried on with greater certainty, he had designed a person for his visitor who had spent some time in the islands, and was well acquainted with the ministers, people, and customs. But the disturbances in Scotland caused him to postpone his intention, and subsequent troubles prevented it altogether.*

Romanism at Court checked by Laud.

The conduct of the queen and her partisans at Court, evidently alarmed the archbishop, who at this time made a speech at the council table concerning the increase of the Roman party, the frequent resort of papists to Denmark House, and the practices which were being favoured so as to undermine those who lived within the verge of the Court. He particularly complained of the influence of Sir Toby Matthewe and Mr. Walter Montague. The first of these was the son of Dr. Toby Matthewe, Archbishop of York, "an undeserving son," exclaims Heylyn, "of a worthy father." The other was a younger son of the first Earl of Manchester, who, having become a Romanist in 1635, was very anxious to proselytise.† These two men were great favourites with the queen, and did a fair amount of mischief at Court. They succeeded in perverting Lady Newport, and naturally enough Lord Newport was very angry. Instigated by Laud, the king spoke so strongly at the council board, "that the fright,"

* Cyp. Ang., p. 336.

† Biog. Brit., pp. 40–7, note. Montague was afterwards promoted to be an abbot, and he died, it is said, with the title of Archbishop of Guienne.

says one, describing the matter to Strafford, "made Wat (*i.e.* Walter Montague) keep his chamber longer than his sickness would have detained him." * The archbishop knew that by his urgency in the matter of the papists generally, and these emissaries of Rome † in particular, he was incurring the hatred of the queen; but he had no regard to this, so long as he felt that he was upholding the Church of England. He was gratified. The king stood firm: Matthewe and Montague were expelled the Court, and the designs of the Romanists were frustrated. Henrietta Maria never liked Laud; he was far too Protestant and severe for her; and now she was highly displeased with him. But she perceived that it would not be wise to have an open rupture with the archbishop, and after a long conversation with him on the subject some two months after the ejection of Montague from the Court, she professed amity. "I had speech with the queen," writes Laud, "for some space, but we parted fair." ‡

Anger of the queen.

It seems extraordinary that Laud should afterwards have been accused of being too friendly with those men whose influence he counteracted, and whose ejection from the Court he obtained. Yet it was so; and it is an instance of how his accusers worked, and of what sort were the charges by which they inflamed the ignorant against him. Though Laud knew Matthewe at Oxford, he rejected any intimacy with him after he had become a Romanist. Even such a small matter as Sir Toby Matthewe § being in the archbishop's garden talking with him was brought

* Lord Conway to Strafford. Strafford's letters, ii. p. 125. See "Rome's Masterpiece," p. 20.

† Matthewe was said to have a commission from Urban VIII. to reconcile England to the Church of Rome. Cant. Doome, p. 456.

‡ Diary, Dec. 12, 1637.

§ He was knighted by King James, Oct. 10, 1623.

CHAP XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

forward on the trial; but Laud could say, "Sir Toby was never in my garden with me all his life." *

Laud's energy against Romanism.

An indefatigable opponent of Romanism was Archbishop Laud, and we find him now amidst the troubles and anxieties which were crowding in upon him, arranging for a republication of that celebrated and standard work, his *Conference with Fisher*. The solid arguments contained in that book are the admiration of all who now enter into the history of the controversies with Rome, and in those days the more impartial adversaries of the archbishop could not but give it a meed of praise. "He hath muzzled the Jesuit," writes Dering, a bitter opponent of Laud, "and should strike the papists under the fifth rib when he was dead and gone. And being dead, that wheresoever his grace should be, Paul's would be his perpetual monument, and his own book his epitaph." †

Laud also busied himself in preventing the propagation of a book entitled "An Introduction to a Devout Life," by Francis Sales, Bishop of Geneva. This is a devout and religious work, but many passages contained in it imply the heretical doctrines of the Church of Rome.

Before publication the unsound passages had been struck out by one of the archbishop's chaplains, Mr. Haywood; but the translator had taken upon himself to re-insert those passages, and the printer had connived at the same, so that the book was printed in its original form. To prevent such a publication, we should say in these days would be foolish—in fact it would be impossible in England—and Laud may be accused of narrowmindedness in not allowing doctrines with which he, or rather the Church of England, did not agree, to be promulgated in print. But he acted according to the principles of the times, and we are only astonished that after such an

* Troubles and Trial. Works, iv. p. 342.

† Preface to Dering's Book of Speeches, p. 5.

exercise of his authority, he should still be regarded as favouring the teaching of Rome. Had he proceeded on the nineteenth century principle, and taken no notice of the book, what a storm of abuse would have been heaped on his devoted head! While he knew that the puritans were on the look-out for anything which they might urge against him, it cannot possibly be said, that he would do anything to further their doctrines, if we may call them doctrines. It was simply from a desire to prevent members of the Church of England from sucking in false and heretical ideas, that the archbishop caused the book of Sales to be called in, and in accordance with the foolish custom of the time to be publicly burnt.*

And against Socinianism.

But while he was thus anxious to prevent the propagation of Romish doctrine, the archbishop was no less careful to prevent, as far as he could, the spreading of Socinianism, which was the name generally given to the tenets of free-thinkers.

This was not one of the dangers of that time, as it is of the present age, but yet the keen mind of the archbishop perceived that great mischief might ensue unless he could stop the disease. A book had been written entitled, *Disquisitio Brevis*,† in which some of the principal Socinian ideas were inserted, under the supposition that they would be the best expedients to allay the differences between the Church of England and that of Rome. This book was ascribed by common report to the learned *Hales* of Eton, who also had circulated a tract on schism, —written, not printed—for the encouragement of those to whom it was sent to despise the authority of the Church. The archbishop sent for Hales, who accordingly waited upon his Grace at Lambeth to learn his will. For hours did these two learned men reason together, not without some heat, until at length the servants had to inform the

Discussion with Hales of Eton.

* Cyp. Ang., p. 338.

† Published anonymously in 1642.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

archbishop how the time had passed away. "It was my chance," says Heylyn, "to be there that day, and I found Hales very glad to see me in that place as being himself a mere stranger to it, and unknown to all. He told me afterwards that he found the archbishop (whom he knew before for a nimble disputant) to be as well versed in books as business; that he had been *ferretted* by him from one hole to another, till there was none left to afford him any further shelter; that he was now resolved to be orthodox, and to declare himself a true son of the Church, both for doctrine and discipline; that to this end he had obtained leave to call himself his grace's chaplain, that, naming him in his public prayers for his lord and patron, the greater notice might be taken of the alteration." * So was Hales gained to the Church, and though the archbishop has sometimes been accused of a want of liberality, it would seem, that when he was convinced of the integrity of an opponent, he evinced towards him a kindness which induced him to give heed to the powerful arguments which Laud had always at hand, with reference to the controversies of the day.

The result.

Laud visits Merton College.

The archbishop still continued the ordinary duties of his position, and on May 24th, 1638, he wrote a letter to the subwarden and fellows of Merton College, Oxford, informing them that he had called the visitors together, and had taken into consideration all those things that had been complained of in his visitation. He appointed Oct. 2nd, for a full hearing of all the complaints, and on that day, and the two following days, he sat at Lambeth "inter horas primam et tertiam." "The warden," he says, "appeared very foul." †

* Cyp. Ang., p. 340. Hales was afterwards appointed prebendary of Windsor.

† Diary, June, Oct. 2, 3, 4. Letter ccclxxxiii., dated May 24. For the injunctions afterwards issued, see Works, v. p. 546.

Next to the entry in the diary concerning this visitation, is one which states that the Marquis of Hamilton had set forth, as the king's commissioner, to appease the tumults in Scotland. "God prosper him," writes Laud, "for God and the king. It was a very rainy day." *

The Marquis of Hamilton sent to Scotland.

A "rainy day" in another sense it was, for Hamilton was not equal to the occasion; and being invested with ample powers to treat with the covenanters, he failed. It may be said, that no man, with the blind zeal of the covenanters on the one side, and the strict commands of the king on the other side, could be successful, and Hamilton was set to a hopeless task. But without impeaching his loyalty, we may affirm that he certainly mismanaged affairs, and by no means exhibited that devotion to the English Church which was conspicuous in the Earl of Strafford. His jealousy of the Marquis of Montrose, among other things, interfered with his usefulness; nevertheless he kept up a constant correspondence with Laud, though he did not always act as the archbishop would advise. In conjunction with the Earls of Roxburgh, Traquair, and Southesk, Hamilton proposed to the king a revocation of almost all that had hitherto been done in favour of the Church. We attribute his conduct not to want of integrity, but to the difficulties of the time. He thought that by a temporising policy troubles might be avoided; and he did his best for that end. But in truth Scotland was already in a state of rebellion, and if the leaders of the anti-church party did not as yet attack the king, they heaped upon the bishops abuse, which was a disgrace to that religion which they professed.

His failure.

State of Scotland.

Stirring up rebellion themselves, they had the inconsistency to term the war in which they were prepared to engage an "episcopale bellum;" and they were ready

* Diary, May 26.

and anxious for the fight. Had they known to what bloodshed and commotion their determination would lead, perhaps they would have hesitated in their course of rebellion. But, as it was, their great desire was to inflame the minds of the people; and preachers were encouraged, far and wide, who would rave about the sword of Gideon and the battle of Armageddon.

The bishops retreated to England, with the exception of Bishop Guthrie, who nobly braved the danger, and three prelates who ignominiously signed their recantation. Many of the clergy were deposed, and orthodox professors were driven from the university. The principles of those who not only professed and called themselves Christians, but, like modern ultra-protestants, regarded themselves as the *only* Christians, may be gathered from the following passage of Bishop Burnet:—"The pulpits," says he, "sounded with the ruin of religion and liberties, and that all might now look for popery and bondage, if they did not acquit themselves like men. Curses were thundered out against those who went not out to help the angel of the Lord against the mighty, so oddly was the Scripture applied; and to set off this the better, all was carried with so many fasts and prayers. By this means it was that the poor and well-meaning people were animated into great extremities of zeal, resolving to hazard all in pursuance of the cause." In proportion as they advanced in power, and the war in violence, the unparalleled cruelties of the covenanting leaders increased. They glutted their eyes with the executions of *malignants*, and one fanatical covenanting minister, after witnessing one hundred executions of *malignants*, declared, "*This wark gaes bonnilie on.*"

The king prepared to meet the Scotch dissenters, now in open rebellion; and the archbishop was directed to write to his clergy to contribute towards the support of

the royal army. Although he only obeyed the orders of the privy council, this circumstance procured for his Grace the appellation of incendiary, and of one who laboured "to set two nations into a bloody war." Let us hear, however, his own declarations on the subject after he was in prison, which none of his enemies controverted:—"God knows," says he, "I laboured long for peace, till I received a great check for my labour. And particularly at the beginning of these tumults, when the miseries of a war first began, in the year 1638, openly at the council table, at Theobalds, *my counsel alone* prevailed for peace and forbearance, in hope that the Scots would think better of their obedience."

After a variety of transactions, generally unfortunate for the king, a temporary pacification was agreed to, on the 17th of July, and ratified by Charles on the 18th, after which he returned to London, nominating the Earl of Traquair his lord high commissioner. Nevertheless, the mutual jealousies had not subsided; no sooner was the treaty concluded than it was broken by the covenanters, and the war was resumed in the following year with redoubled violence. Our attention, however, must be more immediately concentrated upon the archbishop. On the 3rd of April, we find him reconciled to the queen, with whom he was now living on terms apparently friendly. On the 4th of June he received two seditious and scurrilous papers, written by Lilburne, then in the Fleet prison; the one abusing him to the lord mayor and aldermen, the other inciting the apprentices of London to attack his palace. These he delivered to the lords of the council on the fifth of June, but his moderation seems to have inflicted no further censure on this fierce and daring enthusiast.

Laud's further gifts to Oxford.

In the midst of these national commotions and attacks of fanatical hatred, it is pleasing to find the archbishop

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

unmoved, and still appearing the patron of literature and learned men. On the 28th of June, he sent 576 volumes of manuscripts to Oxford, being what he calls "the remainder," and above a hundred of these were Hebrew, Persian, and Arabic. "I had formerly sent them," says he, "above 700 volumes." Such was his zeal for literature, that he spared no expense to benefit that venerable seat of learning, where he himself had first been taught to appreciate the value of knowledge.

Translation of the Liturgy.

Another of the archbishop's actions this year must not be forgotten. He had already caused the Scottish Liturgy to be translated into Latin; for, as that language, though it had long ceased to be vernacular, was still the language of learned men, he wished the whole world to judge of the conduct of the Scots, as to the truth of their allegations that it was popish. The work, unfortunately, though finished, was never published, his troubles coming on apace. Still there was the Liturgy of England, in many respects the same, translated into various languages, by which an adequate judgment could be formed of the conduct of the Scottish schismatics. It had undergone various translations: the first, that of King Edward VI., into Latin, by Alexander Alice, or Alesius, a learned Scotsman, of the University of St. Andrew's, who fled from the vengeance of Archbishop Beaton at the commencement of that tumultuous Reformation; the second Liturgy of that prince, at the command of Elizabeth, by Dr. Walter Haddon, the learned president of Magdalen College, Oxford. It had also been translated into French, as has been said, for [the use of Jersey and the Channel Isles; while Dr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, when Lord Keeper, procured its translation into Spanish. The archbishop was not behindhand, and Petley of Oxford, at his instance, translated it into the Greek language, "that so," says Heylyn, "the Eastern churches might

have as clear information of the English piety as the Western."

Laud also enlisted the services of Bishop Hall, who at his request published his "Episcopacy by Divine Right asserted." Hall was very much assisted in the composition of this book by the archbishop, and such a work was needed, for the political puritans, under the leadership of Bagshaw, were beginning to direct a systematic attack upon episcopacy.

Parliament summoned.

Laud and Strafford now conferred together, and, with the Marquis of Hamilton, advised the king to call a parliament. Well aware was the archbishop, that it was at his own peril that parliament would meet, though he did not know to what extent the hostility entertained by many of the members would be stretched. The 13th of April was the day fixed for the meeting of this assembly.

Proceedings of Parliament.

No sooner was it opened than complaints, more loud and tumultuous than ever, were poured forth by the covenanters against the bishops of the Church of England. Religion was on the lips of the fanatics, while treason was in their hearts. It was the very life and soul of their puritan policy, to direct the whole torrent of public execration against the hierarchy. They knew that the throne would probably remain impregnable, so long as the Church retained her authority and strength. And accordingly they proclaimed aloud that the reformed religion never could be safe, until the dignities of the Church were trampled in the dust. And this nefarious stratagem was adopted by them with as little remorse as the men of carnal warfare resort to the countermarch, or the mine, or the ambuscade. In the meantime, although the rebellion was becoming every hour more fierce and insolent, there appeared no prospect whatever of any supply for its suppression. At length, Sir Harry Vane the elder, then secretary of state, declared in plain terms to his majesty,

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

that, to his knowledge, it would be idle to hope for any money against the Scots. This information was false, and most probably treacherous; and agonising was the regret afterwards expressed by Charles for having listened to it in a moment of impatience and precipitancy. The result of it was that, on the 5th of May, 1640, the Short Parliament, as it was called, was dissolved. In the resolution for this measure, the dissentient voices were only two, those of the Earls of Northumberland and Holland. It happened accidentally that Laud arrived at the board too late to join in the deliberations of the council, and so co-operated only by his single vote. Nevertheless, the whole guilt of the transaction was heaped upon him. The outcry still was, that the dissolution was his work. The very next day libels were posted in various parts of the city provocative of insurrection. And on Saturday, the 9th of May, a paper was found upon the Old Exchange, inviting the apprentices, with others of the rabble, to assemble in St. George's Fields, "to hunt William the Fox, for breaking up the parliament." On the Monday night following, an assault was made on Lambeth Palace by a mob of 500 ruffians, who threatened to tear the archbishop in pieces. Fortunately he had received notice of the design, and had fortified the house in a manner sufficient for his protection from personal violence. Such, however, was the fury manifested by the assailants that, by the king's command, Laud lodged for several days and nights after the attack in the Palace at Whitehall. "This scandalous and headless insurrection" was quelled by the apprehension and execution of one of the most active ringleaders, who was hanged and quartered on Saturday, the 23rd of May, 1640.

Attack on the archbishop's house.

Convocation sits, though Parliament is dissolved.

Previously to the ending of the parliament, the convocation had agreed to grant his majesty six subsidies, amounting in the whole to 120,000*l.*, but payable in six

years, by equal annual portions. Immediately on the dissolution, the archbishop sent to terminate the convocation likewise, forgetting, in the haste and agitation of the moment, that the king's writ was requisite, as well for its dissolution as for its assembling. On being reminded of this, he applied to his majesty for a writ. To his great surprise, the king signified his pleasure that the convocation should continue their sessions; first, in order that they might complete their grant of the six subsidies; and, secondly, that they might finish certain canons which were then under consideration. The archbishop was much perplexed and troubled at this resolution. He had received no previous intimation of it, and he considered both the lawfulness and the expediency of the measure as extremely questionable. He was nevertheless unable to shake the determination of the king, and was compelled to content himself with obtaining his majesty's consent to have the question submitted to the Lord Keeper and the Crown lawyers, for the better assurance and satisfaction of the clergy. The judgment of the lawyers was, that "the convocation, being called by the king's writ, under the great seal, doth continue, until it be dissolved by writ, or commission, under the great seal, *notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved.*" The convocation continued to sit, accordingly, till the 29th of May. They perfected their act for the contribution to the king, and they framed seventeen canons for the better government and peace of the Church. On the first publication of these canons, they were received with general approbation. Letters were addressed to the archbishop from all parts of the kingdom, expressive of this sentiment. But within a little month after they were printed, the London ministers began to whisper against them; then to clamour loudly; and lastly to circulate their complaints in writing; till at length this whole body of ordinances was vehemently cried out upon,

Proceedings of convocation.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

and as usual, the main fury of the tempest fell upon the head of the archbishop.

Of all the proceedings of this synod, there was none which drew upon the Church a heavier load of obloquy than the insertion of an oath, which was to be imposed not only on all the clergy, but on many of the laity; and by which they were to declare that they never would consent to any alteration in the government of the Church, by bishops, deans, archdeacons, &c. Everyone in his right senses must have seen that this *et cetera* had been introduced solely for the purpose of avoiding a needless enumeration of offices. Nevertheless, an insane and almost universal outcry was raised against it by the *agitators* of the day. It was spoken of as a snare and a pitfall. It was denounced as the entrance into a yawning abyss of perjury. It was held up to universal detestation, under the name of the *et cetera* oath, and by that name it has ever since been known. But, further, the whole oath itself was furiously censured as "wicked and ungodly;" and was afterwards condemned by the Commons, as devised by the archbishop for the purpose of "confirming the unlawful and exorbitant power which had been usurped over his majesty's subjects." It was lastly contended that the imposition of any oath whatever was an act beyond the legal power of the convocation. This outcry, though plausible enough, was purely the dictate of malignity and faction. For, as Laud affirmed on his trial, even if the law was against the bishops on this point, still there were various precedents hitherto unquestioned decidedly in their favour; so that at the very worst, their delinquency amounted to no more than a mistake of the law, and not to a wilful and treasonable violation of it. Nevertheless, the attempt was insisted on as conclusive of the malicious and despotic temper which pervaded the whole hierarchy!

The canons passed.

The canons passed were seventeen in number, which, as Lord Clarendon observes, bear more against Socinianism than the acts of any other Christian assembly. They were published in quarto, under the authority of the great seal, and are entitled, "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, presidents of the Convocations for the respective provinces of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces," and are accompanied by a royal proclamation. The titles of the several heads are: 1. Concerning regal power. 2. For the better keeping of the day of his majesty's most happy inauguration. 3. For suppressing the growth of popery. 4. Against Socinianism, which is termed a "damnable and cursed heresy," a "wicked and blasphemous heresy." 5. Against sectaries, to wit, "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, or other sect or sects." 6. An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and governments. 7. A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies. 8. Of preaching for conformity. 9. One book of articles to be used at all parochial visitations. 10. Concerning the ordination of the clergy. 11. Chancellors' patents. 12. Chancellors alone not to censure any of the clergy in sundry cases. 13. Excommunication and absolution not to be pronounced but by a priest. 14. Concerning commutations, and the disposal of them. 15. Touching concurrent jurisdictions. 16. Concerning licences to marry. 17. Against vexatious citations.

The canons were the great business of the convocation at that time, though "some other things there were in proportion and design that never ripened into act of execution." One of these designs was an English *pontifical*, which was to contain the *form* of his majesty's coronation, to serve for future ages on all similar occasions. Another was a

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

*form* for the consecration of churches and churchyards; and a third for reconciling those who had been under penance, or who had revolted from the faith to Mahometanism. It was proposed that these three services, with the offices for Confirmation and Ordination, should form a distinct volume. The design was, however, frustrated by the troubles of the times. Exceptions also were taken to the prayer in the 55th canon, and a short prayer was drawn up, containing the heads of that in the canon; "and being so drawn up," says Heylyn, "it was to have been tendered by the hands of one of the clergy, who would have undertaken that it should be universally received by all those which disliked the other." Laud, however, fearful of a new experiment, preferred adhering to the canon which was formed on the injunctions of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth.

Danger of the archbishop.

The archbishop was now aware that his life was in danger. He did not probably expect to die on the scaffold, but he knew that assassination was at this time justified by the dissenters in Scotland, and he had a warning, that the same doctrine had obtained among the ultra-protestants of England. On September 21st, 1640, he received a letter, signed by a person unknown, in which the writer intimated that while he was travelling through the bishopric of Durham, he heard it openly declared by the covenanters, that they hoped to see him shortly meet the dark fate of the Duke of Buckingham; and the writer concluded by advising him to be on his guard. Fearing that the rabble would give him another visit at Lambeth Palace, he ordered the High Commission Court to assemble at St. Paul's. His apprehensions were not groundless; for on October 22nd, about 2,000 fanatics, named Brownists or Independents, and Anabaptists, commenced a tumultuous uproar in the court, destroyed the benches in the consistory, and exclaimed that they would

have no bishops, no High Commission. Here also it was found necessary to station a guard to repel the furious puritans, who had now, observes Heylyn, "grown so audacious in these disorders, partly from the near approach of the parliament, but principally by the invasion of the Scots, that they contemned the law and defied the magistrates."

These were all sufficient indications to the archbishop of his approaching ruin, and indeed he seems to have been long aware that he would fall a victim to fanatical schism and rebellion, and to have prepared himself for it with heroic fortitude. "Now verging," says his chaplain, "towards the age of seventy years, the period which the psalmist had assigned to the life of man, there wanted not many sad presages of his fall and death." Long had his ruin been meditated by the puritans. From the first moment of his entrance into public life, their persecutions and calumnies had been bitter and unrelenting. His enemies were many and powerful; the faction to which they adhered, every day acquired strength by the wild fanaticism and rebellion engendered by the northern covenanters. The whole of the puritans were arrayed against him, whether Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Familists, or Gospellers: the Jesuits, too, had intrigued against him who was the greatest enemy which Rome had encountered since the days of Luther. Puritans, monks, and covenanters all united in one common cause. Many of the nobility, and almost the whole of the Scottish nation were leagued against him; several of whom forgot the signal services he had rendered them, in their haste to exult ingloriously over the ruin of the poor old primate. The puritans charged him with what they were pleased to term innovations in religion, and falsely alleged that he was the original promoter of the troubles, because he had so often restrained their seditious practices. The Jesuits

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

sided with his enemies because his vigorous conduct had defeated their designs, and his learning had produced a volume before the logic of which Rome will never cease to quail. Among the nobility he had many enemies, because his inflexible integrity made him disdain the petty artifices of courts and the dastardly intrigues of faction, and because his zeal for justice sometimes transported him into an incautious and hasty warmth of expression, by which he refused to listen to the insinuations of corruption. Finally, the Scottish covenanters, among whom the Calvinistic tenets had widely spread, were exasperated against him because they conceived him to be the main instrument in maintaining the apostolical order of the Scottish Church. They falsely charged him with the composition and introduction of the Scottish Liturgy.

False charges against him.

The "Long" Parliament.

On November 3rd, the Long Parliament met; and it became the most bloodthirsty tribunal that ever sat until the period of the French Revolution. They began by murdering the noble Strafford, and did not complete their work until some of the first nobility of the land had followed the primate and the sovereign to the block.

The cry that religion was in danger from the machinations of popery was revived, and of popery it was insinuated that the king as well as the archbishop were the patrons. These ultra-protestants, consisting of the Presbyterians, the Independents, and those puritan churchmen who then, as now, accorded with dissenters in principle, formed the popular body, and they petitioned for the execution of Goodman, a priest who had received judgment of death for having taken orders in the Church of Rome. They formed themselves into an inquisition to "purge the Church;" and condemning as scandalous every conscientious churchman, replaced those who, for refusing to

conform to the Church, had been deprived of these offices. They proceeded to the impeachment of Strafford, conducting his trial with pitiless rancour, and without any regard to justice; and at length, taking for their patron the most unconstitutional of our monarchs, Henry VIII., these champions in the cause of freedom abandoned the way of impeachment, and proceeded by that of attainder. They thirsted for the blood of their victim, the greatest man in England, and when they could not succeed by law, they condemned him in spite of the law.

Several of those who would now be called members of the opposition party, had made preparations for the parliament which they knew would be soon convened. Hampden had visited Scotland, and Pym had held meetings in the English counties. Many of those who were animated by patriotic feelings and also would restrain the powers of the Crown, were certainly not at first animated by fanatical enthusiasm; neither had they entertained a notion which certainly crossed the powerful mind of Oliver Cromwell at a later period, that, consistently with the dominance of one sect, toleration might be granted to all. The men just referred to appealed to the religious prejudices of a people excited almost to madness on that subject; and when fault was found with them for adopting this course, they said that unless they appealed to the religious feelings of the people, the people would not assist them.* It was soon seen that the king's friends would receive no toleration at the hands of the parliament.

Strafford had arrived in England, and it was imme-

* In all ages there have been certain statesmen, who, never having read the history or studied the philosophy of the Church, have dogmatized on subjects of which they are avowedly ignorant, to obtain the support of the fanatics they despise.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

diately determined to impeach him. The statesman who for eight years had governed Ireland with firmness and wisdom, who had repressed the disorders of that turbulent kingdom, and, at the hazard of his own life, had maintained the dignity of the crown, might well expect to have been received with favour on his return to his native land. But he soon discovered his mistake. He perceived how bitter his enemies were, and he even shrunk at first from his attendance in parliament. The king urged that attendance upon him, and declared that he was able to protect him from danger, and that the parliament should not touch a hair of his head.

Impeachment of Strafford.

Persuaded by the king, Strafford took his place in the House of Lords. He had scarcely done so, when Pym appeared carrying up the impeachment to the upper house. They had been preparing the measure as soon as it was known that Strafford had arrived in London. Prepared as the earl was for the worst, he was unprepared for such an attack as this. He was immediately ordered into custody ; and the king was almost left alone, Windebank and Finch having fled the country. With respect to Laud a paper was published entitled " A particular of the manifold evils, pressures, grievances, carried and practised on occasions by the prelates and their dependents." A debate took place in the Commons on the late convocation and canons—which were condemned as contrary to the rights of Parliament, the property and liberty of the subject, and as containing matters tending to sedition, and of dangerous consequence. Attention was then directed to the promoters of the new canons, and to consider in particular how far the Archbishop of Canterbury was an actor in all the proceedings of them ; and in the great design of the subversion of the laws of the realm and of religion. They were to prepare and draw up a charge against him, and such others as should appear offenders. It does

A paper published against Laud.

not appear that the death of the archbishop was already designed. The aim of his enemies seems at first to have been to remove him from the council of the king, and to confine him to his diocese.*

Prejudice against Laud inflamed by the Scottish commissioners.

The prejudice against him became more and more inflamed, and more serious measures were suggested, when he was impeached by the Scottish commissioners in the House of Lords, as an incendiary. Their charge against him was of alterations in religion being pressed on the Scottish nation against the law, and contrary to the forms established in their kirk. They complained that a new book was established, together with a Liturgy or common prayer which carried many dangerous errors of doctrine. We have already seen that it was only very indirectly that Laud was concerned in these affairs, and that on some points he did not agree with the Scottish bishops. Meantime the Scottish commissioners had a church assigned to them in London, for the exercise of their presbyterian rites. The most violent sermons were here addressed to the multitude, and the clergy were insulted by mobs of incendiaries. The fanaticism soon found an expression in the House of Commons, where, on December 18th, a debate took place on the archbishop's conduct. Sir Harbottle Grimston gave his reasons why they should proceed a little further against the archbishop than a bare sequestration.

Grimston's speech.

"We are now fallen on that great man," he said in the House; "look upon him as he is in his highness, and he is the sty of all the pestilential filth that hath infected the state and government of this commonwealth. Look upon him in his dependencies, and he is the man, the only man, that hath raised and advanced all those that, together with himself, have been the authors and causes of all our ruins, miseries, and calamities we now groan

* Cyp. Ang., p. 435.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

under. Who else but he only that hath brought the Earl of Strafford to all his great places and employments?—a fit spirit and instrument to act and execute his wicked and bloody designs in these kingdoms. Who is it but he only that brought Secretary Windebanke into this place of trust and service, the very broker and pander of the whore of Babylon? Who is it, Mr. Speaker, but he only that hath advanced all our popish bishops? I shall name but some of them: Bishop Manwaring, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Bishop of Oxford, and Bishop Wren, the last of all those birds, but one of the most unclean ones. These are the men that should have fed Christ's flock, but they are the wolves that have devoured them." It is not necessary to quote more of this speech, nor to comment upon it, further than to say, that it was listened to by the House of Commons without remonstrance. The Long Parliament had not evidently many members of gentlemanly feeling amongst them.

Vote of the House that Laud was a traitor.

Taken into custody.

The debate ended with a vote of the House, that the archbishop was a traitor; and an order was carried up to the House of Lords by Denzil Hollis, for the primate's committal. He was immediately committed to the custody of Maxwell, gentleman usher of the black rod. Being now placed as a criminal at the bar of the House, the archbishop desired permission to proceed to Lambeth, and to prepare for his defence by consulting his papers. The afternoon was granted him for this purpose, on condition that the search for his papers should take place in the presence of the gentleman usher of the black rod. He delayed his visit to Lambeth till the evening, wishing to avoid the public gaze. He attended prayers in his own chapel: the psalms of the day—the 93rd and 94th—together with the 50th chapter of Isaiah, "gave me," he says, "great comfort. God make me worthy of it, and

fit to receive it."* At length he prepared to enter his barge. But he was surrounded on leaving his door by hundreds of his poor neighbours, who had often experienced his bounty, and who, with sorrowful hearts, witnessed his misfortunes, and invoked heaven for his safe and speedy return to Lambeth.

Fined for a previous judgment.

On the 21st of December the archbishop was fined 500*l.* for having kept Sir Robert Howard prisoner, after he had assisted Lady Purbecke, his mistress, to escape from the Gatehouse, where she was in custody for adultery. After this the parliament seemed to forget the archbishop, directing their whole attention to the case of Strafford.

Laud remained for about ten weeks in the custody of Maxwell, being obliged to defray his own expenses, at the rate of twenty nobles a day, but receiving every kindness and attention from his custodian. During this time he was gratified by the information given him by a "parliament-man of good note," that the House of Lords were so well pleased with his deportment, that considerable indications of favour towards him were evinced. He might possibly escape, it was told him, with banishment from the Court, and the loss of the archbishopric. He was glad, he said, to hear of any favour, considering the times, but considering his innocence, he could not hold this for a favour. "And I could not but observe to myself," he continues, "what justice was to expect, since here was a resolution taken among the leading men in the House, what censure should be laid upon me, before any charge, so much as a general one, was brought up against me."†

An opinion on Laud's conduct.

Laud now determined that he would formally resign the chancellorship of Oxford, and through the Bishop of London he acquainted his majesty with his determination.

Resigns chancellorship of Oxford.

* Diary, Dec. 18.

† Troubles and Trial, p. 147. Works, iii. p. 395.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633-45.

The Earl of Pembroke, who had "long gaped for the place," behaved very unkindly, in adding to the troubles which were now falling thick upon Laud; "and yet," exclaims the archbishop, "I had in all the time of my prosperity observed him in Court more than ever he had deserved of me." The letter in which Laud sent his resignation of the chancellorship is affecting. "My present condition," he writes, "is not unknown to the whole world, yet by few pitied or deplored; the righteous God best knows the justice of my sufferings, on whom, both in life and death, I will ever depend: the last of which shall be most welcome, in that my life is now burdensome unto me; my mind attended with variety of sad and grievous thoughts, my soul continually vexed with anxieties and troubles, groaning under the burden of a displeased parliament, my name aspersed and grossly abused by the multiplicity of libellous pamphlets, and myself debarred from wonted access to the best of princes, and it is *vox populi*, that I am Romishly affected. How earnest I have been in my disputations, exhortations, and otherwise, to quench such sparks, lest they should become coals, I hope after my death you will all acknowledge; yet in the midst of all my afflictions there is nothing more hath so nearly touched me as the remembrance of your free and joyful acceptance of me to be your chancellor, and that I am now shut up from being able to do you that service which you might justly expect from me. When I first received this honour, I intended to have carried it with me to the grave; neither were my hopes any less, since the parliament (called by his majesty's royal command) committed me to this royal prison. But since (by reason of matters of greater consequence yet in hand) the parliament is pleased to procrastinate my trial, I do hereby as thankfully resign my office of being chancellor, as ever I received that dignity, entreating you to elect some

honourable person, who, upon all occasions, may be ready to serve you; and I beseech God send you such an one as may do all things for his glory, and the furtherance of your most famous university. This is the continual prayer of your dejected friend and chancellor."

Affecting, too, is it to find the archbishop, at this very time when malice and spite were in league against him, offering earnest supplications for his enemies. "O Lord, I beseech thee," he prayed, "forgive mine enemies all their sins against Thee, and give me that measure of Thy grace, that for their hatred I may love them, for their cursing I may bless them, for their injury I may do them good, and for their persecution I may pray for them; Lord, I pray for them, forgive them, for they know not what they do. Amen.

His prayers for his enemies.

"Deus pacis et charitatis, da omnibus inimicis mihi pacem et charitatem, omniumque remissionem peccatorum, meque ab eorum insidiis potenter eripe; per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen." *

But the enemies of the archbishop, being at a loss how to act, had recourse to those arts which ultra-protestants have not, even in these days, renounced. After he was placed in the custody of the Black Rod, all the winds of obloquy were let loose upon him. The council-chamber, the Star Chamber, the Court of High Commission—all were discovered to have been the scenes of his triumphant iniquity. No complaint could be made, in the upper or the lower house, relative to any place or thing in which he had ever been concerned, but *he* was found to have been the principal minister of evil. The agents of mischief were unwearied in their search for excitements, by which the hatred of the people might be inflamed to madness. The tumultuous ovation with which Prynne,

* Works, vol. iii. p. 64.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Burton, and Bastwick were brought back to London, was the signal for a fresh discharge of all the artillery of popular malice. Ballads and libels were issued, prodigious in multitude, and monstrous in scurrility and falsehood, and all directed against the person and calling of the archbishop. The lies went forth in swarms, unnoticed by censure or prohibition from the parliament, to the scandal of honest men and to the disgrace of a Christian community. Indeed, the whole treatment of the archbishop, from this time to the moment of his death, adds another proof to the display both of injustice and want of mercy in revolutionary tribunals. It would seem as if the malice of his assailants, when baffled (as it long was) by the difficulty of finding treasonable matter against him, indemnified itself by calculating on his demolition at the rate of so many grains a day. The period for which he remained under the charge of the gentleman usher was no less than ten weeks; and, during the whole of this interval, the fees due to that functionary, together with the expenses of the archbishop's diet, amounted to twenty nobles a day; making, in the whole, a sum of 436*l.* and upwards; all of which was received by the head lictor, without the abatement of a single penny. We learn from Heylyn that, during his confinement at Mr. Maxwell's, his gentle and patient demeanour so completely won for him the good opinion of the gentlewoman of the house, that she reported of him to her companions that, although he was but a silly fellow to hold converse with a lady, he was the most excellent and pious soul she had ever met with. But he was now about to appear once more before an assembly who were unwilling to give him credit for a single virtue. On the 26th of February, 1641, the articles of impeachment were brought up from the Commons to the Lords; and, thereupon, a vote was passed for transferring him to the Tower. The arch-

His demeanour under imprisonment.

bishop was ordered to attend the House; and there the articles were read to him at the bar.

It is needless here to recapitulate the articles exhibited against the archbishop; it is enough to say that he was charged with being the sole cause of all those evils which afflicted the kingdom, although they were justly chargeable on the dissenting party. These fourteen articles he has separately answered in the affecting History of his Troubles and Trial, and with inimitable eloquence and clearness. The archbishop, when the charge was brought against him, replied in an address which ought to have covered his accusers with confusion.

Articles exhibited against him.

He had been ordered to attend the House, and the articles of impeachment were severally read to him at the bar, when in obedience to the summons he appeared before his judges. Indignantly he repelled the charge of treason brought against him, and then advancing, drawing up his body which had been bowed down by his cares and age, he steadily fixed his eyes on the House, and asked permission to address it. "My Lords," he said, "this is a great and a heavy charge, and I must be unworthy to live if it can be made good against me, for it makes me against God in point of religion, against the king in point of allegiance, and against the public in point of safety under the justice and protection of law. And though the king be little, if at all, mentioned, yet I am bold to name him, because I have ever been of opinion that the king and his people are so joined together in one civil and politic body as that it is not possible for any man to be true to the king as king, that shall be found treacherous to the state established, and work to the subversion of the people; though perhaps every one that is so is not able to see through all the consequences by which one depends upon the other. So my charge, my lords, is exceeding heavy in itself, though I do not as yet

His speech to the Lords.

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

altogether feel the weight of it. For 'tis yet, as your lordships see, but in generals, and generals make a great noise but no proof; whereas 'tis proof upon particulars that makes the weight of a charge sit close upon any man. Now, my Lords, 'tis an old and a true rule, *errare contingit descendendo;* error doth most often happen, and best appear, when men descend to particulars, and with them when I shall be charged, I hope my innocence will furnish me with a sufficient answer to any error of mine that shall be thought criminal, or any way worthy the cognizance of this high and honourable court. As for human frailties, as I cannot acquit myself of them, so I presume your lordships will be honourable judges of them, since in the transaction of so many businesses as passed my hands, men far abler than ever I can be, have been subject to them, and perhaps to as many and as great. But for corruption in the least degree (I humbly praise God for it), I fear no accuser that will speak truth." The charge that he was false to his Church grieved the archbishop most. That he, the champion of the Church of England against Rome, who had given so much of his time, his labour, his thoughts, to the suppression of Romanism, should be accused of labouring to introduce Romish superstition, "this," he exclaims, "troubles me exceedingly, I confess, my lords, and if I should forget myself and fall into passion upon it, I should but be in that case which St. Jerome confessed he was in when he knew not how to be patient when falsehood in religion was charged upon him." *

With regard to the articles of Laud's impeachment, the reader of history who aims at impartiality may justly complain of modern historians, and some of high character, who assumed for granted all the falsehoods which sectaries produced in their attacks on the archbishop.

* Troubles and Trial. Works, iii. p. 397.

It seems impossible to suppose that they can have read the history of his trial. The clearness, the sincerity, and, generally speaking, the calmness with which he refutes one and all of the charges brought against him, must create an interest in his favour in any mind, however prejudiced against him. An old man called suddenly to account for almost every action of his life, might indeed be pitied; but in the case of Laud, our astonishment at his powers overwhelms every other consideration. He called upon all the great lawyers of the day who had a seat at the council table, to bear witness, that in all constitutional questions he had asked for their advice, and followed it. He admitted that by the law of God a king, in the just and necessary defence of himself and his kingdom, might levy money from his subjects; but he always contended that where a particular national law intervened in any kingdom, or was settled by mutual consent between the king and his people, then money ought to be levied by, and according to, law. But when mention was made of the fundamental laws of England, which it was said that he had subverted, he remarked that it was impossible to define what those laws were, and he asserted that in many instances a prejudiced judge might at any moment make the law. He suggested that to make a digest of the common law, and submit it to the opinions of the judges, would be an act worthy of the parliament. But before a general charge was made against a man for subverting the fundamental laws of the realm, it ought first to be known very clearly what those fundamental laws really are.

Laud was again roused to indignation when he returned to the charge of a tendency to Romanism. He referred to his book against the Jesuit Fisher, he appealed to those many persons whom he restrained from perversion to Rome, and with equal confidence, he ap-

CHAP. XXXVI.

William Laud. 1633–45.

pealed in proof of his innocence to the hatred exhibited towards him by the recusants at home, and their co-religionists abroad. "I think," he says, "that the greatest enemies I have are of opinion that had I turned of the Romish party, especially if I had been such a champion for them as this article sets forth, I should not only have been welcomed, but rewarded by them; at least I would have lived in credit if not in honour. This being granted, fain would I know what could stay me here save my conscience and the truth. Sure not a concern for wife and children, for I have them not; and since this late calamity hath overtaken me, I most humbly and heartily bless my God, that I have not any of these to increase my misery. Not the *greatness* of my place, for if in this present fall anything be put either upon it or me that a knowing conscience ought to check, the world shall soon see how little I value Canterbury when my conscience is at stake. Nor yet the *honour* of my place, for, if I stood upon that, well do I know how malice hath laid it in the dust, or lower, if that can be. Who can conceive that I would endure so much hatred and so many base libels as have filled the streets against me, and such bitter revilings in print as the gall of some pens have cast upon me, when I might elsewhere go and live with content and reputation. Nothing but conscience could stay me here in this condition. Nor yet the *wealth* to be got in my place, for the archbishopric of Canterbury is very far short of its alleged value, as I have given a faithful account to my sovereign; but were it never so wealthy in revenues, every benefit over and above my necessary and decent expenses, I have refunded back upon the poor, the public, or the Church, whence I had it, as churchmen in better times than these were wont to do. Here then could be no external motive to induce me to remain here save my conscience, and my conscience

not being that way set, no man can so much as think that I would, at the hazard of my life, my honour, and all that I hold dear, practise the change of religion, and that against my conscience. But hard am I beset. The pope's agent, as it is said, plots my death on the one hand because I will not be induced to aid and countenance the Romish superstition, and the parliament, on the other, attempts to overthrow me, pretending that I am in league to introduce the superstition; so that I am in the prophet David's case, for I also heard the blasphemy of the multitude, and fear is on every side while they conspire together against me, and take their counsel to take away my life, but my hope is in Thee, my God."

Committal to the Tower.

After the archbishop had delivered before the House of Lords the speech of which a report has before been given, he humbly desired of the Lords that his going to the Tower might be delayed till the Monday following, in order that he might have time to make his lodgings there fit for his reception. This request was made on Friday, February 26th, and was granted. He thanked their lordships, and returned to Mr. Maxwell's custody. In the afternoon of the same day he sent his steward to the Lieutenant of the Tower, that a lodging might be prepared for him, and he got himself in readiness to take up his sojourn in that prison, from whence he knew he would only issue to his trial and to his death.

# CHAPTER XXXVII.

## LAUD IN THE TOWER AND ON TRIAL.

Laud in the Tower.—Visited by his friends.—Urged to escape.—Opportunities for escape given.—His confinement made more irksome.—Committee of Religion.—Trial of the Earl of Strafford.—Excitement of the populace against the Earl.—The king passes the bill of attainder.—Usher visits Strafford.—Farewell between Strafford and Laud.—Death of Strafford.—Impeachment of Bishops.—The Bishops deprived of jurisdiction.—Libellous attacks made upon Laud.—Sequestration of his jurisdiction and his estate.—Weakness of the king.—Visit of Prynne to the Archbishop's chambers.—Seizure of his papers.—Temporalities and patronage taken by Parliament.—A parliamentary synod.—Laud subjected to great annoyances.—Fourteen articles displayed against Laud.—He appears before the bar of the House.—The charge against him, misdemeanour or treason?—Delay of trial.—Unfair treatment of Laud in the House of Lords.—The trial.—Laud's reply to Wilde's speech. The Archbishop treated with scorn.—Multiplicity of charges against Laud.—His speech in defence.—Prynne's description of it.—Laud is attainted at the bar of high treason.—His answer in the Commons.—He appeals to the House.—Voted guilty of high treason in the Commons.—And in the Lords.—The king sends a free pardon.—Laud is condemned to be hung.—His request to be beheaded is granted.—He prepares for death.—Cruel questions put to him on the scaffold.—His last sermon.—His last prayer.—Laud is beheaded.—His last will and testament.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Passage through the City.

On the evening of the 1st of March the feast of St. George was to be kept. Mr. Maxwell was bound by his office to attend the solemnity, and therefore he could not attend the archbishop to the Tower in the evening as he desired. It was arranged, in consequence, that they should proceed at noon, when the citizens would be at dinner, in the hope and expectation that Laud's passage through the City

might be kept private. No notice was taken of him, until he had passed through Newgate shambles and entered into Cheapside. There he was recognised by an apprentice, who shouted, and a mob was soon raised, by which the coach was followed until they came to the Exchange. The numbers increased as they proceeded on their way, and the shouting, clamour, and revilings "went," to use the archbishop's own words, "even beyond barbarity itself." The tumult did not cease until they had entered the Tower gate. It is due to Maxwell to remark that (again using the archbishop's words), "he, out of his love and care, was exceedingly troubled at these proceedings."

The patience of Laud, however, was not disturbed for a moment by the clamours of the crowd. "I look," he said, "upon a higher cause than the tongues of Shimei and his children."

The following prayers, found among his private devotions, shew the spirit in which the aged primate bore his afflictions at this time :—

"If I find favour in Thine eyes, O Lord, Thou wilt bring me again, and shew me both the ark and the tabernacle, and set me right in Thy service, and make me joyful and glad in Thee. But if Thou say (O for Jesus His sake say it not) I have no pleasure in thee ; behold, here I am, do with me as seemeth good in Thine own eyes. Amen.

"O Lord, though I be afflicted on every side, let me not be in distress : though in want of some of Thy comforts, yet not of all : though I be chastened, yet let me not be forsaken : though I be cast down, let me not perish : and though my outward man decay and perish, yet let my inward man be renewed daily, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord, whatsoever Thou shalt lay upon me, I will

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

hold my peace, and not open my mouth, because it is Thy doing and my deserving. Amen.

"O Lord, Thou hast dealt graciously with Thy servant according to Thy word. For before I was troubled I went wrong, but now have I prayed that I may keep Thy law. And it is good for me that I have been in trouble, that so I may learn still to keep it better, in the mercies of Jesus Christ. Amen.

"I know, O Lord, that Thy judgments are right, and that Thou of very faithfulness hast caused me to be troubled. O let Thy merciful kindness be my comfort, according to Thy word unto Thy servant, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord Almighty, O God of Israel, the soul that is in trouble, and the spirit that is vexed, crieth unto Thee. Hear, O Lord, and have mercy, for Thou art merciful."

On his being committed to prison, he was accustomed to pray thus :—

"O Lord, have mercy upon me, and bring my soul out of prison, that I may give thanks unto Thy name, even in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"O Lord, blessed is the man that hath Thee for his help, and whose hope is in Thee. O Lord, help me and all them to right that suffer wrong. Thou art the Lord, which looseth men out of prison, which helpest them that are fallen. O Lord, help and deliver me, when and as it shall seem best to Thee, even for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord, Thine indignation lies hard upon me ; and though Thou hast not (for Thy mercy is great) vexed me with all Thy storms, yet Thou hast put my acquaintance far from me, and I am so fast in prison that I cannot get forth. Lord, I call daily upon Thee, hear and have mercy, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"O Lord, Thou which bringest the prisoners out of captivity, while Thou lettest the runagates continue in

scarceness, have mercy upon me, and deliver me out of the prison and affliction in which I now am; and give me grace, that being free, I may faithfully and freely serve Thee all the days of my life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Lord, turn Thee unto me, and have mercy upon me, for I am desolate and in misery. The sorrows of my heart are enlarged: O bring Thou me out of my troubles. Look upon mine adversity and misery, and forgive me all my sins, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Hear my crying, O God, give ear unto my prayer; from the ends of the earth, whithersoever Thou shalt cast me, I will call upon Thee when my heart is in heaviness. O set me upon the rock that is higher than I, to be my hope and a strong tower against my oppressors. Amen.

"Save me, O God, for the waters are entered into my soul. I stick fast in the deep mire where no stay is, I am come into deep waters and the streams run over me. They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of my head, and they which would destroy me causeless are mighty. O let not these waterfloods drown me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me. Hear me, O Lord, for Thy loving kindness is great, turn unto me according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies. Hide not Thy face from Thy servant, for I am in trouble, but draw near unto my soul, and redeem it, for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen.

"My soul melteth away for very heaviness, comfort Thou me according to Thy Word. Amen.

"O Lord, trouble and heaviness have taken hold upon me; patience, good Lord, that for all this my delight may be in Thy commandments. Amen.

"O Lord, my sins have made me a rebuke to my eighbours, and to be laughed to scorn of them that are

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

round about me. O suffer me not longer to be a by-word among the people. My confusion is daily before me, and the shame of my face hath covered me. The voice of the slanderer and blasphemer hath overtaken me. And though all this be come upon me, suffer me not, O Lord, to forget Thee, or to behave myself frowardly in Thy covenant, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Destroy their tongues, O Lord, and divide them, for I have seen cruelty and strife in the city. But I will call upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou wilt save me. Amen.

"O Lord, send down from heaven, and save me from the reproof of them that would swallow me. Send out Thy mercy and truth, for my soul is among lions: I lie among the children of men that are set on fire, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword. O deliver me, and I shall magnify Thy name for ever. Amen.

"I am become a monster to many, but Thou art my sure trust. O be Thou my anchor for ever. Amen.

"O remember, Lord, the rebuke that Thy servant hath, and how I do bear in my bosom the rebukes of many people. O remember me. Amen."

Laud in the Tower.

In the Tower the archbishop was subjected to many inconveniences; but at first his confinement was not close or strict. He was confined, as it were, within the precincts of the Tower, and was, as was the custom, permitted to receive visits from his friends. Among these visitors appeared the celebrated Dr. Edward Pocock. Pocock being the first oriental scholar of his age, had been appointed to the Arabic lectureship which the munificence of Laud had established at Oxford.

The archbishop had sent him to the East, that with the assistance of Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople—a friend with whom Laud was in correspondence—he might procure MSS. for the University library.

In 1639 the archbishop had urged Pocock to return to England. Passing through Paris, Pocock saw Hugo Grotius, and on his authority he told the primate that his committal had made a profound sensation on the Continent. From that great scholar he conveyed a message intreating his grace to follow the example which had been set by Grotius himself, of making his escape from prison and visiting some place beyond seas, there to preserve himself till better times should come.

It is probable that some of those who had not the courage to expose themselves to the rancour of the puritan faction, but who, nevertheless, felt shame at their conduct, hoped that the archbishop would save them from the charge of pusillanimity by making an escape from his prison. Laud himself admits that facilities for escape were afforded him; but of those facilities he declined to avail himself.

Urged to escape.

His reply to the message brought to him by Pocock was this: "I thank my good friend Hugo Grotius for the care he has thus expressed of my safety, but I can by no means be persuaded to comply with his advice. An escape is, indeed, feasible enough; yea, I really believe it is this that my enemies desire. Every day an opportunity is presented to me, a passage being left free, in all likelihood, for this purpose, that I should take advantage of it, but they shall not be gratified by me in that which they appear to long for. I am almost seventy years old, and shall I now go about to prolong a miserable life by the trouble and shame of flying? And were I willing to be gone, whither should I fly? Should I go to France or any other popish country, it would be to give some seeming ground to that charge of popery they have endeavoured with so much industry, and so little reason, to fasten upon me. If I should get into Holland I should expose myself to the insult of those sectaries there to

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

whom I am odious, and have every anabaptist come and pull me by the beard. No; I am resolved not to think of flight, but continue where I am, patiently expect and hear what a good and wise Providence has appointed for me, of what kind soever it may be." *

He refuses.

When it was found that the archbishop would not escape, the puritans gaining the ascendancy, his confinement became more close, until at last he was not permitted to see anyone except in the presence of one of the warders.

His confinement made more irksome.

It added to the discomfort of the archbishop that he had to mourn over the loss of Adam Torless, a servant of two-and-forty years' standing, who had, for some time, discharged the office of steward in his household. In him Laud lost an old and confidential friend, who had been to him a comfort and counsellor during his old age and affliction.

In the meantime the members of parliament were busy preparing means for carrying on the work which they had taken out of the hands of the archbishop.

Committee of religion in the upper house.

A committee for religion was named in the upper house of parliament, consisting of ten earls, ten bishops, and ten barons.

The committee was to treat of doctrine as well as ceremonies; and to that end certain divines were summoned to consider of and prepare business. At the head of the bishops appeared Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, soon after to become Archbishop of York.

The appointment of this committee naturally excited alarm in the mind of Laud; but, "This committee," he said, "will meddle with doctrine as well as ceremonies, and will call some divines to them to consider of the

* Twells' Life of Pocock, p. 20.

business; as appears by a letter hereto annexed, sent by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln to some divines to attend this service. Upon the whole matter, I believe this committee will prove the national synod of England, to the great dishonour of this Church. And what else may follow on it God knoweth."

The archbishop's prediction was fulfilled. The Lords did appoint a sub-committee, of which the Bishop of Lincoln was chairman, and which was composed of men of both parties. They considered the alleged innovations of doctrine, and of discipline; whether the Common Prayer Book should not in some respects be altered; and also the regulation of ecclesiastical government. Among other matters that came before the sub-committee was the use of "altar-lights"; of canopies over the altar; of curtains round the sanctuary; and of the credence table. The moderation which this sub-committee displayed, might have been productive of good results; but their meetings came to nothing. Fuller says that the "Court prelates expected no good from the result of this meeting, suspecting the doctrinal puritans, as they nicknamed them, would betray the Church." But when the condition of the leading prelates is considered—Laud and Wren in custody, Montague dying of an ague, and Manwaring under censure of the House of Commons—it is evident that Fuller must be mistaken. The Presbyterian party broke it off, seeing that what they most desired, the abolition of episcopacy, would not be carried by it. It was generally the policy of that party to ask only a little, and so claim for themselves the character of moderation. But when that little was likely to be granted they took care, by underhand intrigues, to prevent it. In this case directly they saw a chance of concessions being made, they got the bill "The root and branch" passed. Of

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

the shameless means which they adopted to gain the rabble of London, and their purses, an account is given in a letter of Dr. Baillie, their agent.*

Laud's attention was now turned towards the fate of the Earl of Strafford. He also was in the Tower, though the two friends were not permitted to meet. The trial of the Earl of Strafford began on Monday, the 22nd of March, and, with some few intermissions, continued till the end of April. The great lawyers engaged in his cause affirmed, without contradiction, that it was impossible to convict him of treason, upon which the whole Commons left the House of Lords with indignation, and passed a bill of attainder against him; and as no law could reach him, they made a law to take away his life. The bill was opposed by a minority, amounting to more than fifty. The majority, however, excited the rabble and posted up at the Exchange, under the title of Straffordians, all who refused to vote for his murder. The king went down to the House of Lords on Saturday, the 1st of May, and declared to both Houses that, having been present at every day's hearing, he was fully convinced that Strafford's faults, whatever they were, could not amount to treason. He added that if they meant to proceed by bill, it must pass by him; and that he could not, in his conscience, find him guilty, and never would wrong his honour and his conscience so far as to pass such a bill. He advised them to proceed by way of misdemeanour, and he then would concur with them in any sentence they might pronounce.

Trial of the Earl of Strafford.

The king's conduct gave great offence to the parliament, and considerable pain to Laud. The indication of the king's feeling tended only to excite the House of Commons, and even some of the Lords, against the doomed earl.

* Letter 27.

For several days large masses of the citizens of London and the apprentices went down to parliament shouting for justice, and asserting that, till justice were done on the Earl of Strafford, there would be a stoppage of trade. Growing bolder still, they threatened the king and his court with the vengeance of the people, if speedy justice were not done. The bill was brought up to the Lords, and passed in a thin House. On the 9th of May the multitude appeared before Whitehall, and threatened to pull it down, if the bill for Strafford's execution were not passed.

Feeling in the city against Strafford.

The king committed now the great error and sin of his life—he passed the bill of attainder. Late in the night Sir Dudley Carleton arrived at the Tower and warned the earl that he must prepare to die on the Wednesday following. Laud remarks that "the Earl of Strafford received the message of death with great courage, yet sweetness, as Sir Dudley himself, after, told me."

The king passes the bill of attainder.

On the Monday morning the earl sent for the Lord Primate of Armagh, James Usher. His grace attended, and, says Laud, "the same day he visited me, and gave me very high testimony of the earl's sufficiency and resolution, and among the rest this: that he never knew any layman in all his life that so well and fully understood matters of divinity as the earl did, and that his resolutions were as firm as good."* An offer was made to the earl that if he would employ his power and credit with the king for the taking of episcopacy out of the Church, he should yet have his life. His answer was that he would not purchase his life at so dear a rate. This message was sent to him by his brother-in-law, Denzil Hollis; and the Lord Primate of Armagh declared that

Strafford prepares for death.

* Troubles and Trial, Works, vol. iii. p. 442.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

he had received the information from the Earl of Strafford's own mouth. The night before his execution he desired to have an interview with his old friend Archbishop Laud; but he was informed by the Lieutenant of the Tower that without an order from parliament this request could not be granted. A further petition to parliament the earl would not condescend to make; but turning to Archbishop Usher he said, "I will tell you what I would have spoken to my Lord of Canterbury. Desire the archbishop to aid me by his prayers this night, and to give me his blessing when I go abroad to-morrow, and to be at his window that, when I pass, by my last farewell I may give him thanks for this and all his former favours." Usher proceeded to Laud's apartments, and delivered the message of his friend. Laud was now bowed down by years, by care, and by anxiety; he was no longer what he once had been. He felt his weakness, and seems to have been ashamed of it. His prayers and his blessing he could easily promise; but he feared that his weakness and grief would not permit him to behold the destruction of his friend.

Desire to see Laud not granted.

The farewell between Strafford and Laud.

It was almost as he feared, for on the following morning, though the archbishop prayed earnestly, the feebleness of his body and the agitation of his mind for some time rendered him powerless. At last, however, he contrived to reach the window, from whence he could see his friend; and then, as Laud himself informs us, "he turned towards me and took the solemnest leave that I think was ever by any at a distance taken one of another." The archbishop put forth his hands in the act of blessing, but he could not speak; and overcome with his emotion, he fell back fainting into the arms of his attendants, scarce able to catch the last touching words of Strafford—"Farewell, my lord. May God

Death of Strafford.

protect your innocency." The earl passed on to the scaffold.

After mentioning the glorious end of his friend, Laud remarks—"Thus ended the wisest, the stoutest, and in every way the ablest subject that this nation hath bred these many years. The only imperfections which he had, that were known to me, were his want of bodily health, and a carelessness, or rather roughness, not to oblige any; and his mishaps in this last action were that he groaned under the public envy of the nobles, served a mild and a gracious prince, who knew not how to be or to be made great, and trusted false, perfidious, and cowardly men in the northern employment, though he had many doubts put to him about it. This day was after called by divers, 'Homicidium comitis Straffordiæ' the day of the murder of Strafford; because when malice itself could find no law to put him to death, they made a law of purpose for it. God forgive all, and be merciful." Shortly after Strafford's murder, the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission were very properly abolished. This was accomplished by the patriots, and was a lasting blessing to the country. It was also determined to deprive the upper house of parliament of one of its component parts by preventing the Lords Spiritual, who were there in right of their baronies, from taking part in the debates.

Impeachment of certain bishops.

The next movement was to impeach thirteen prelates for the part they took in passing the late canons. Under the direction of Williams, who at first thought it was his policy to court the puritans, but was now alarmed back into orthodoxy, twelve of his brethren appealed to the king. Williams in their name protested against the validity of the proceedings of parliament, during the compulsory absence of the Lords Spiritual. The bishops were, on this account, arraigned by the House of Com-

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

mons for high treason, and sent to the Tower, with the exception of the Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Hall, and the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Morton, who were consigned to the custody of the Black Rod.

To accuse them of high treason was simply ridiculous, but it enabled the Commons with the greater plausibility to carry their great point. Ten of the prelates, after eighteen days of imprisonment, were released; but on the 6th February, 1642, all the bishops were deprived of their authority, and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was vested in a committee of the House of Commons. The king hesitated to sign the bill; but there was no one at hand to support him in his resolution, and in his weakness he gave his consent. He understood that the Church could still exist under its episcopacy though the bishops were deprived of their baronies and were no longer lords of parliament; but he soon found that he had taken a step which, unwise in itself, endangered his crown. It is probable, that he would have maintained his ground if the queen, in her hatred to the English Church and its episcopacy, had not persuaded her husband in his weakness to yield. She had been under the impression, that if she appeared as the adviser of this measure, she would render herself acceptable, not only to the House of Commons, but to the whole nation. She appealed to the king when he scarcely had the heart to say nay to any request she might make, for he was accompanying the queen to her embarkation for Holland. He was with her at Canterbury when the royal assent was notified by commission to parliament. This was one of the last bills which he accepted, and it was the only bill to which he assented in prejudice of the Church. On Church matters he now determined to make a stand.

All the bishops deprived of authority.

All these proceedings weighed heavily on the archbishop's mind; but his only remark when he heard of

the passing of the bill was, "God be merciful to this sinking Church."

The archbishop at the same time felt very deeply the attacks made upon himself. Libels and ballads were spread through the city, and sung up and down in the streets. Pictures were made of him to expose him to ridicule, and the libels made men sport in the taverns and alehouses, where too many were as drunk with malice as with liquor. Laud's remark on these libels was, "I thank God for it, they were as full of falsehood as of gall." He said that his only comfort was that he had fallen to the same case as the prophet David (Psalm lxix.): "For they that sat in the gate spake against me, and I was the song of the drunkard." His health, however, gave way. Never robust, he was at all times subject to sudden attacks of illness, and during his confinement in prison he was several times afflicted with the prevalent disease of ague. It was not in Laud's nature to retain with complacency an office of which he was unable to perform the duties.

Libellous attacks made upon Laud.

Laud's health fails.

A further insult was offered to the archbishop by the sequestration of his jurisdiction by the House of Lords in the month of October. His diocese was to be administered by his inferior officers; this was done at the instigation of Williams, who had now become Archbishop of York; "a bitter revenge," says Wharton, "which no art or colour can defend."

Sequestration of Laud's jurisdiction.

This suspension was to continue until he was acquitted or convicted of the charge of high treason. It was further ordained that concerning those ecclesiastical benefices, promotions, or dignities, which were at his disposal, he should present to the House the names of such persons as should be nominated by him to the same, to be approved by the House before their collation or institution.

Still further measures were in progress. A bill had

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Disendowment of the Church.

already passed the House of Lords that all rents and profits of all archbishops, bishops, deans, and chapters, should be sequestered for the use and service of the commonwealth. The king had, at this time, raised the royal standard at Nottingham. The royalists were rallying round their sovereign, but the Scottish covenanters, in league with the English puritans, prevailed against him. An army of presbyterian enthusiasts, invited by the parliament, joined forces with their "dear brethren" in England against the king.

They had bargained before their arrival that the covenant should be taken. This was another direct attack upon the Church, for they who took the covenant subscribed to the 2nd article, and declared that without respect of persons they would endeavour "the extirpation of popery and prelacy, that is church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, and all other ecclesiastical offices depending on that hierarchy." *

Delay of Laud's trial.

In vain did the primate petition for a trial; a petition so reasonable that it found support in the House of Lords. It seems evident that his enemies, though determined upon his destruction, did not know how to proceed. It was proposed at one time to banish the primate and Bishop Wren to New England, but this vengeance was not sufficient to meet the desires of his enemies. Deprived of his books, prohibited from communication with his friends, he was, of course, after the sequestration of his revenues, utterly destitute of any maintenance, and yet it was expected that he should defray the expenses of his imprisonment.

He, an uncondemned and untried prisoner, petitioned the House of Lords, humbly praying that their lordships

* Confession of Faith, &c., &c. of Public Authority in the Church of Scotland, p. 469.

would take his sad case into their honourable consideration, that something might be allowed him out of his estate to supply the necessities of life, assuring himself that in honour and justice they would not suffer him to beg or starve. He petitioned in vain. He had refused to collate a wild fanatic to one of his benefices, acting thus, as he says, "in accordance to his duty to his Saviour and his God," yet this was made the pretext on the part of parliament for not acceding to his request. In Lambeth Palace Laud had still property to the value of 200*l.*, and again he met with a refusal, when he asked that a portion of it might be sent to the Tower, to relieve his present necessities.

Prynne was indefatigable in getting up charges against the primate, but the attention of parliament being directed to other objects, the trial was still delayed.

Publications against the Church, and against toleration.

Laud's mind was also disturbed by the fury of the rabble against the Church, stirred up as they were, in the ignorance of their wrath, by publications the very titles of which would occupy more than one of our pages. What strikes us as remarkable is, that the presbyterians openly avowed their hostility to toleration. Not only the Church, but independency, as well as popery, erastianism, arminianism, and all sects were denounced.

Weakness of the king.

Throughout Laud's history of his Troubles we can trace as implied, rather than expressed, his attachment to the king. So little regard was paid to his writings, that Laud avoided as much as he could any mention of the royal name, but he knew the king's weakness, and he feared for the safety of king and kingdom, when he considered that when Hyde had left the Court, there was no mind capable of giving strength to a character which fell, through its weakness, into grievous errors, if not, as in the case of Strafford, into actual sin. We may add to this the king's unfortunate signature of the bill which deprived

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

the bishops of their baronies, and consequently of their votes in parliament.

There is something prophetic in his remark on this royal mistake, which was celebrated in London by bonfires, the ringing of bells, and other symptoms of joy.

"If it proves," said Laud, "that the king and kingdom may have joy in it, it is well. But it may be that the effects of this eclipse may work further than is now imagined, and the blackness of it darken the power of the temporal lords more than is anticipated."

Inquisitorial visit of Prynne.

That Laud received hard usage we can scarcely deny. He was nearly three years a prisoner before he was brought to a trial. Although he was still uncondemned his revenues were sequestrated, his goods were sold, and his palace turned into a gaol. His confinement to the Tower had gradually become more close, and on the 31st of May, 1643, William Prynne, with a warrant from the House of Commons, entered his lodgings in the Tower as soon as the gates were open. The archbishop was in bed, and when he opened his eyes he saw three soldiers, with muskets already cocked, in attendance on Prynne, who had entered the apartment after placing guards at the door of the lodging. "I presently thought," says Laud, "of my blessed Saviour, when Judas led in the swords and staves about him." Prynne proceeded to rifle even the pockets of the clothes which the archbishop had put off. The primate demanded a sight of his warrant; this Prynne exhibited, and Laud saw that it was expressly stated that his pockets should be searched. When this was done the archbishop rose, got his clothes about him, and so, half ready, with his gown upon his shoulders, he attended Prynne while he made his search for papers throughout the room. Prynne took into his possession twenty-one bundles of papers, which Laud had prepared for his defence; two letters from the king, with reference

to collations to benefices; the Scottish Service Book, with such directions as accompanied it; his diary, containing all the occurrences of his life, and his book of private devotions, the last two written entirely in his own hand.

Laud humbly asked that his book of private devotions might be left to him, but Prynne refused.

"He must needs see," says Laud, "what passed between God and me, a thing, I think, scarce ever offered to any Christian." A trunk standing by his bedside was rifled, though nothing was found in it but forty pounds in money, for his necessary expenses, and a bundle of gloves, which Prynne was so careful to open that he caused each glove to be looked into. Laud could not resist a little of that playfulness, on this occasion, of which we have specimens while treating of important business in his letters to Stafford.

He offered to make a present to Prynne of one pair of the gloves; and when he demurred as to the acceptance of them, Laud told him he might take them without incurring the charge of bribery, for he had already done to him all the mischief he could, and no favour had been asked of him. Prynne thanked his grace, and took the gloves. He then bound up the papers which he had seized, and took his departure, leaving two sentinels at the door, who were not dismissed till the next day at noon. "I was somewhat troubled," says Laud, "to see myself used in this manner, but knew no help but in God, and the patience He had given me; and how His gracious providence over me, and His goodness to me, wrought upon all this, I shall in the end discover, and will magnify it, however it will succeed with me." Although Prynne had promised to restore the papers within three or four days, that promise he never kept, but after the lapse of five months, out of the twenty-one parcels he returned three.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

On the 10th of June the primate was deprived of all his temporalities, and his patronage passed into the hands of the parliament. This, which was intended to annoy him, was in fact a relief. Till now, he felt himself responsible for the disposal of the benefices of which he had the patronage; and while, on the one hand, he was unable to prefer any friend or chaplain of his own, he had unfit men forced upon him by the puritans in parliament, and was liable to arbitrary punishment if he refused to obey their commands.

Parliament takes the temporalities and patronage.

He was vexed when he heard that the English convocations were to be superseded by the synod of divines (so called), not elected by the clergy but nominated by the two Houses of Parliament. This synod, if synod it may be styled, consisted for the most part of persons hostile to the Church; but, "I pray God," says the primate, "that befall not them which Tully observes fell upon Epicurus—'si quæ corrigere voluit deteriora fecit'—he made everything worse that he went about to mend. I shall, for my part, never deny but that the Liturgy of the Church of England may be made better, but I am sure withal it may easily be made worse."

A "synod" appointed by parliament.

He had some consolations even at this period. Sir Kenelm Digby, as is well known, became a papist, but had the generosity to send a confidential message to the primate in which he mentioned that a committee evidently appointed about the primate's business, examined him strictly concerning the archbishop and his religion, Laud's acquaintance with himself being regarded as suspicious. The question was asked whether Laud had received the offer of a cardinal's hat, and other such like things.

"He answered them," says Laud himself, "that he knew nothing of any cardinalship offered me, and for my religion he had reason to think that I was truly and

really what I professed, for that I had laboured with him against his perversion to the Church of Rome, which is true, and I have some of my papers yet to show. But he further sent me word that their malice was great against me, though he saw plainly they were like men that groped in the dark, and were to seek what to lay to my charge. But soon after mutterings arose that Mr. Prynne, and his church, had found great matters against me, and that now I should be brought to trial out of hand."

Laud subjected to further annoyances.

The archbishop was still subjected to sundry petty annoyances, such as the frequent change of his warder for no discoverable reason, and insulting sermons in the Tower chapel. One Sunday a man preached in a buff coat and scarf, over which, indeed, he had the decency to throw a gown. He had been a clergyman, and was now the captain of a troop of horse; and on another occasion, during the afternoon sermon, a letter was thrust under the door of Laud's prison, subscribed "John Brown," filled with the grossest personal abuse.

The time of the archbishop's trial drew near, his destruction being part of the price which was paid to the Scots for the service they were rendering the puritans. The business was left chiefly to Prynne. He had taken possession, as we have seen, of the primate's papers, and by this time, the primate observes, "his malice had hammered out something," and in the year 1641 fourteen articles were exhibited against Laud.

Fourteen articles against Laud.

As, however, these articles did not result in an immediate trial, we may presume that the enemies of Laud who had any sense of decency, refused to act until further discoveries had been made. Certain it is that ten more articles were now added, though they did little more than reiterate the charges against him which had been already made. The substance was that he had endea-

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

voured to introduce arbitrary government, by causing the dissolution of the parliament; that he had endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom; that he had restrained the civil judges in the administration of their duty; while reference was made to the affair of impropriations and the convocation of 1640. The Articles were drawn up in due form, and on the 23rd October were presented to the House of Lords by Serjeant Wilde.*

Laud is desired to answer at once.

The archisbishop was served with a notice to prepare his answer before the 31st of the same month.

His revenues having been seized, he was dependent upon the charity of his friends, and it was not, therefore, to be expected that he could employ counsel. When it is remembered that the papers which he had been preparing for his defence had been taken away by Prynne, it seems to be hard measure that he should have been required, in the space of seven days, to prepare an answer to the twenty-four articles exhibited against him.

He requests time, counsel, and money.

He therefore petitioned the Peers that counsel might be assigned to him, and named two lawyers—Chute and Hearne—making request that they might have free access to him at all times. He further requested that money might be allowed to him out of his estate to fee his counsel, and defray his other charges; that his books and papers might be restored to him, a solicitor supplied, and further time allowed for the elaboration of his defence. His petition was for the most part granted; his appointment of a solicitor—Mr. Dell, his secretary—was confirmed, and his request for two servants to go about his business complied with. Besides John Hearne and Challoner Chute, Richard Gerrard

* Cyp. Ang., p. 480.

and Matthew Hale were permitted to take part as his counsel.* The House of Commons agreed also with the Lords that he should have copies of any of the papers taken from him, but at his own charge. We have here, in his record of this fact, a burst of Laud's natural impetuosity, which, during his imprisonment or trial, was certainly controlled, and in his patience apparently eradicated. "Wonderful favour this," he exclaims, "and as much justice; my estate all taken from me, and my goods sold before ever I came to hearing, and then I may take copies of my own papers at my own charge!" It was, however, agreed by the House of Lords that some allowance should be made to the archbishop out of his sequestered estates, to meet the expenses of his trial.

Laud appears before the bar of the House.

At last, on the 13th November, the archbishop appeared in the House of Lords; and he who, for many years, had occupied the first place in that assembly, as primate of all England, was now placed a criminal at the bar.

The remainder of this meeting shall be given in Laud's own words: "My answer being put in, I humbly besought their lordships to take into their honourable consideration my great years, being three score and ten complete, and my memory and other faculties, by age and affliction much decayed; my long imprisonment, wanting very little of three whole years, and this last year very little better than close imprisonment; my want of skill and knowledge in the laws to defend myself; the generality and uncertainty of almost all the articles, so

* Cyp. Ang., p. 481. Works, vol. iv. p. 35. Hearn and Chute were assigned by order of the Lords, Oct. 24: Hales added by their order, Oct. 28: and Gerard, Jan. 16. These orders are given in Rushworth. The celebrated Sir Matthew Hale was not at this time of high repute, but he was of considerable assistance in the defence of Laud.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

that I cannot see any particulars against which I may provide myself, &c. While I was speaking this the lords were very attentive, and two of them took pen and paper at the table and took notes, and it was unanimously granted that my counsel should be heard, and so they were. And the order then made upon their hearing was that they should advise me and be heard themselves in all things concerning a matter of law, and in all things whether of law or fact that was not charged as treason, and that they would think upon the distinguishment in time convenient. This was all I could get, and my counsel seemed somewhat better content that they had gotten so much. Not long after this I heard from good hands that some of the lords confessed that I had much deceived their expectation, for they found me in a calm, but thought I would have been stormy, and this being so, I believe the two lords so careful at their pen and ink made ready to observe any disadvantages to me which they thought choler and indignation might thrust forth, but, I praise God the giver, I am better acquainted with patience than they think I am." *

Ambiguity of the charge against Laud.

Misdemeanour or treason?

It is evident that Laud's conduct appealed to the generous sentiment of many who heard him. One lawyer remarked, "The archbishop is a stranger to me, but Prynne's tampering with the witnesses is so palpable and foul, that I cannot but pity him and cry shame." The articles, which were chiefly drawn up by Prynne, had been so framed that it was impossible to distinguish those which related to misdemeanour from those which it was implied had reference to treason. This was a source of great perplexity to Laud's counsel, and is the circumstance alluded to in the previous extract, in which it was said that the lords "would think upon the distinguish-

* Troubles and Trial. Archbishop Laud.

ment in time convenient." Prynne prepared the witnesses and kept, what the archbishop terms, "a school of instruction for those whom he could trust."

The long delay in bringing Laud to his trial was indeed cruel to him, but it admits of a favourable solution. We must bear in mind that the House of Commons, at this time, consisted of two parties—of the patriots, if we may so call them, and of the fanatics. The former were engaged in drawing up the Grand Remonstrance, and had to keep the latter in good humour, in order to procure unanimity in the proceedings of the House.*

Reasons for delay of trial.

The avarice and vices of the courtiers had been such that they had robbed the king to enrich themselves. These great men had excited the indignation of Laud, and, because he determined to recommend for employment in the offices of State only persons who would look to the royal interest, such as Bishop Juxon, he found among the courtiers adversaries as bitter, though for fear of offending the king, not so openly abusive, as he had found among the puritans.

The parliament, more powerful than he, had taken measures to put a stop effectually to these peculations of the courtiers—peculations which rendered any amount of subsidies, or of money otherwise raised, insufficient for the king's service. By their exertions those monopolies were abolished, of which, even in Queen Elizabeth's time, complaint had been made, and which the great queen in her last years attempted, with only partial success, to abolish. The gain to the king, as Prynne truly asserted, was small; the loss to the subject large. To the exertions of the patriots, as I shall call them—though I must join

* A very similar course is pursued at the present time. Men ignorant of ecclesiastical history, and who have never studied theology, busy themselves in theological discussions less from religious zeal, which they profess to despise, than from a desire to head a party.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

in the condemnation very frequently of the manner in which their great ends were accomplished—we are indebted for asserting the principle, that no taxation under any form shall be tolerated without the sanction of parliament; though in justice to Charles, to Laud, and to Strafford, we must remark that this was not the constitutional law when the direction of affairs rested with them. We are to give all praise to the patriots for the abolition of the Star Chamber and High Commission Court, through which, regarded as courts of appeal, the law of the land was often superseded; though, here again, we must claim allowance to be made for the king and his ministers, who, before the abolition of those courts, acted in accordance with the law then in existence. By the same patriots the Forest laws were reformed, and the oppressions of the Stannary Courts were abolished; the subject was relieved from the vexations to which in quest of money he was sometimes exposed, through the revival of obsolete laws, such as the law which required persons in certain positions to accept knighthood, or to pay a fine for declining the honour. They who were thus employed had little time to think of Laud, except to rejoice that the king was deprived of a counsellor, who might have urged him to oppose the reforms demanded by the country. It is to be remembered that at first the reformers were, or professed to be, churchmen. But being in a minority, however, they could not carry their points without the assistance and support of the puritans and fanatics; and, therefore, they courted them by yielding to their prejudices.

The party was not slow to admit the fact. One man, who was under an obligation to the archbishop, said that he knew the archbishop to be a good man, but received for answer, "Be he never so good, we must now make him ill for our sakes." Among the citizens of London,

it was reported to Laud that some were heard to say that he answered on his trial many things very well, but that yet he must suffer, for the honour of the House.

Fanaticism is infectious, and from courting the puritans many men of ordinary acquirements caught the disease of fanaticism, and were gradually absorbed in the majority of the House. A few rose from fanaticism into greatness, as was the case with Oliver Cromwell. This celebrated man gradually rose from the ranks of puritanism, but, with his usual sagacity, he obtained a glimpse of that modern toleration which is an honour to our age and a blessing to the country. That same sagacity led Cromwell to see that, as the country then existed, it must be subjected to the rule of one. He himself became that one, but by doing so he endorses, to a certain extent, the policy for upholding which Charles, Strafford, and Laud were brought to the block.

While the great men were labouring to promote the public good, they cared little for what was done by the puritans, so long as they obtained their votes and support. While Prynne and his followers were plotting the destruction of Laud, the leading men among the patriots, being only anxious to get rid of him, offered many facilities to aid him in an escape from the Tower, as we have already had occasion to mention. But at last fanaticism extended to the higher quarters, and even where men did not become fanatical themselves, they found it expedient to conciliate the puritans in England, and the presbyterians in Scotland.

Whether the view here taken be correct, or not, I dwell not upon it, for I have now, as the historian of Laud, to revert to the hardships to which he was exposed by the puritans, for tolerating which, it is impossible to exonerate from blame many of those who ought to have controlled what was the mere madness of a faction.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Laud, in the House of Lords, unfairly treated.

During this period little can be said in extenuation of the conduct of the members of the upper house; nothing could exceed their pusillanimity except their injustice. Laud's trial before their lordships lasted for five months; the archbishop was heard twenty days in his own defence. He justly complains that there were never above fourteen peers present at one time, generally about twelve; of these one-third left the House every day before the business was concluded.

He never had, any one day, the same lords present at his defence in the afternoon that were at the charges brought against him in the morning. Some leading lords were scarcely present at his trial four days throughout its whole length, nor three at his defence. No one lord was present at his whole trial, except Lord Gray of Wark, the Speaker, without whose presence there could not be a House. The charge against him generally lasted till two o'clock. He was then commanded to withdraw; and in reply to his humble petition for time to answer, no more was given to him than to four o'clock the same afternoon, scarcely time enough, as he truly observes, "advisedly" to peruse the evidence. His counsel were not suffered to come to him until he had made his answer, nor any friend except his solicitor, Mr. Dell, to turn over his papers, the warder of the Tower sitting by to watch the proceedings. At four, or soon after, the House sat again, and he made his answer. If he produced any witness, that witness was not suffered to be sworn; so that it was like a testimony at large, which the Lords might believe or not, as they thought fit. After his answer, one or more of the committee replied; an adjournment usually took place at half-past seven o'clock. He was several times put to the expense, and, at his advanced age, the overwhelming trouble of attending the House without any result, except that he was exposed to the revilings

of the mob, until, on reaching the Tower, he felt his very prison to be a place of repose. We may here remark that his defence rested upon irrefragable principles. He was accused of treason; but, as his counsel showed, when no one treasonable act had been proved against him, such a crime as treason could not be established by any accumulation of charges. "If the generals," they said, "be not treason, the particular instances cannot be; and, on the other side, if the instances fall short of treason, the application to those generals cannot make them treason." *

Commencement of the trial.

On Tuesday, 12th March, the trial really began: a worn-out, grey-headed old man, the archbishop, took his seat, without a tremor or look of anger, at the bar. The proceedings were opened by a speech made by Wilde, of considerable length; but the sting was in the tail, when he informed their lordships that he presented to them a great man, who, like Naaman, was a leper.

Wilde's speech.

Laud defers his reply.

The archbishop, admitting that he was troubled to see himself made vile in such an honourable assembly, desired of the Lords two things; first, that they would withhold their belief from the loud but loose assertions made, until they were proved; and secondly, that while deferring his answer to the particular gentleman's speech till he should hear his proofs, they would permit him to speak a few things concerning himself and the impeachment brought against him.

His speech on the impeachment.

Permission being given, he rose and said—"My being in this place and this condition recalls to my memory that which I have long since read in Seneca—'Tormentum est, etiam si absolutus quis fuerit causam dixisse'—it is not a grief only, though it is no less than a

* Hearn, one of Laud's counsel, remarked on this head that "four black rabbits would never make one black horse."

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

torment, for an ingenuous man to plead, criminally, much more capitally, at such a bar as this; yea, though it should so fall out that he is absolved. The great truth of this I find at present in myself; and so much the more because I am a Christian; and not that only, but in Holy Orders; and not so only, but by God's grace and goodness preferred to the greatest place this Church affords, and yet now brought, 'causam dicere,' to plead, and for no less than life, at this great bar. And whatsoever the world thinks of me, and they have been taught to think more ill than—I humbly thank Christ for it—I was ever acquainted with, yet, my lords, this I find 'tormentum est'—it is no less than torment to me to appear in this place to such an accusation."

His feeling for the Church of England.

He repelled with indignation the charge brought against him of treason, or an attempt to overthrow the law. "As for religion," he continued, "I was born and bred up in and under the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law. I have, by God's blessing and the favour of my prince, grown up in it to the years which are now upon me, and to the place of preferment which I yet bear; and in this Church, by the grace and goodness of God, I resolve to die. I have, ever since I understood aught in divinity, kept one constant tenor in this my profession, without variation or shifting from one opinion to another for any worldly ends; and if my conscience would have suffered me to shift tenets in religion with time and occasion, I could easily have slid through all the difficulties which have pressed upon me in this kind. But of all diseases I have ever hated a palsy in religion, well knowing that too often a dead palsy ends that disease, in the fearful forgetfulness of God and his judgments. Ever since I came in place I laboured nothing more than that the external public worship of God, too much slighted in most parts of this kingdom,

His desire for decency in public worship.

might be preserved, and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be; being still of opinion that unity cannot long continue in the Church, were uniformity shut out of the church-door. And I evidently saw that the public neglect of God's service, in the outward face of it, and the nasty lying of many places dedicated to that service, had almost cast a damp upon the true and inward worship of God, which, while we live in the body, needs external helps, and all little enough to keep it in any vigour. . . . . Further, my lords, give me leave I beseech you to tell you this also, that I have as little acquaintance with recusants of any sort as I believe any man of place in England hath; and for my kindred, no one of them was ever a recusant but Sir William Webb, grandchild to my uncle Sir William Webb, sometime Lord Mayor of London, and him, with some of his children, I reduced back to the Church of England, as is well known, and I as able to prove." He proceeded next with indignation to rebut the charge of an attempt on his part to bring in popery. If he had any inclination towards the Church of Rome, he asks, "what should have kept me here (before my imprisonment to endure the libels and the slanders and base usage in all kinds which have been put upon me, and these to end in this question for my life); I say I would fain know a good reason for this. For first, my lords, is it because of any pledges I have in the world to sway me against my conscience? No, sure, for I have no wife nor children to cry out upon me to stay with them; and if I had, I hope the call of my conscience should be heard above them. Or secondly, is it because I was loth to leave the honour and profit of the place I was risen unto? Surely no; for I desire your lordships and all the world else should know that I do much scorn honour and profit, both the one and the other, in comparison of my

Denies any intimacy with recusants.

Rebuts the charge of desiring popery.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

conscience. Besides, it cannot be imagined by any reasonable man, but that, if I could have complied with Rome, I should not have wanted either honour or profit. And suppose I could not have had so much of either as here I had, yet sure, would my conscience have served me that way, less of either, with my conscience, would have prevailed with me more than greater against my conscience. Or thirdly, is it because I lived here at ease and was loth to venture the loss of that? Not so, neither, for whatsoever the world may be pleased to think of me, I have led a very painful life, and such as I could have been very well content to change had I well known how; and had my conscience led me that way, I am sure I might have lived at far more ease, and either have avoided the barbarous libellings and other bitter grievous scorns which I have here endured, or at the least been out of the hearing of them. Nay, my lords, I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice, for any alteration to popery or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world; and let nothing be spoken against me but truth, and I do here challenge whatsoever is between heaven and hell to say their worst against me in point of my religion, in which, by God's grace, I have ever hated dissimulation, and had I not hated it, perhaps it might have been better for me for worldly safety than now it is; but it can no way become a Christian bishop to halt with God. Lastly, if I had any purpose to blast the true religion established in the Church of England and to introduce popery, sure I took a very wrong way to it, for, my lords, I have stayed as many that were going to Rome, and reduced as many that were already gone, as I believe any bishop or other minister in this kingdom hath done, and some of them men of great abilities, and some of them persons of great place; and

is this the way, my lords, to introduce popery? I beseech your lordships to consider it well, for surely if I had blemished the true Protestant religion I could not have settled such men in it; and if I had purposed to introduce popery, I would never have reduced such men from it. Though it please the author of the 'Popish Royal Favourite' to say that scarce one of the swaying lord prelates is able to say that he ever converted one papist to our religion, yet how void of charity this speech of his is, and how full of falsehood, shall appear by the number of those persons whom, by God's blessing upon my labours, I have settled in the true Protestant religion established in England."

He then proceeds to enumerate the conversions he had made, and mentions among others his having established the Duke of Buckingham in his allegiance to the English Church, remarking "that through the continual cunning labours of Fisher, the Jesuit, and the persuasions of his mother, he was almost lost from the Church of England." After which he concluded with saying, "And now, my lords, with my most humble thanks for your lordships' favour and patience in hearing me, I shall cease to be farther troublesome for the present, not doubting but I shall be able to answer whatever shall be particularly objected against me."

Conclusion.

The archbishop was ordered to withdraw. As he went from the bar a man named Hoyle, an alderman of York, with some other persons, whom the primate did not know, overwhelmed him with terms of scorn. Instead of replying, the archbishop went quietly into the little committee chamber at the entrance of the House. But he was not left at peace even there, for thither Hugh Peters* followed and upbraided him, telling him that he,

Laud is scornfully treated.

Hugh Peters.

* This man was originally an actor; becoming serious he was ordained by Bishop Montaigne; he soon became a wild fanatic and as such was employed by Cromwell, whom he thought he ruled. He was

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Peters, and other ministers were able to name thousands that they had converted. Laud, who had never seen the man before, remarked that, nevertheless, he had heard enough of him.

So violent was Peters that he would have struck the poor old man, if Mr. Hearn, Laud's counsel, had not stepped in between them and rebuked the uncourteous behaviour of the fanatic, as exhibited towards one in such deep affliction. The Earl of Essex having come into the room, Mr. Hearn complained to him of Hugh Peters' usage of the archbishop; and the archbishop, who records the event, says that the earl "honourably checked Peters for his conduct, and sent him forth." It is difficult to account for this outbreak of choler on the part of these puritans, unless, as Laud suggests, they were angry to hear him say so much in his own defence, especially his conversion of so many persons, which they little expected.

Peters soon after preached at Lambeth, and told the people that a great prelate, their neighbour, had bragged in parliament house, that he had converted two-and-twenty, but that he had wisdom enough not to tell how many thousands he had perverted. Laud remarks upon this, "God of His mercy relieve me from these reproaches, and lay not these men's causeless malice to their charge." When Laud was dismissed he received the command of the House to appear again the next day, at nine in the morning.

This was the usual hour at which he was summoned to attend, though seldom called to the bar of the House for two hours afterwards. During the delay he was subjected more or less to the insults of which we have given a specimen.

supposed to be the headsman who murdered Charles I., but as no proof of the fact exists, the story is no longer credited.

It has been an act of justice to Laud to present the reader with this speech, in which he manfully defends himself against the charge which most annoyed him, that of being unloyal to the Church of England.

It will not be necessary to enter into all the details of his trial, some portion of his defence having been already anticipated, from time to time, in explanation of his conduct.

Length of trial.

The impossibility of finding Archbishop Laud guilty of treason by any even obsolete law, or even, as Guizot expresses it, by "the tyrannical traditions of parliament," made his trial a weary and complicated process, such as would soon have weighed down a weak and aged man, with a heart less stout than that of Archbishop Laud.* On Thursday, 4th April, he was again brought to the House, being exposed "a sufficient scorn and gazing-stock to the people." But after waiting some hours he was sent back to his prison unheard.

The object seems to have been to expose him to these personal insults, for we find it recorded that six times during the same month he was thus fruitlessly summoned, and dismissed amidst the yellings of the people. Laud very justly complains of these useless citations, each appearance costing him as much as six or seven pounds, a sum sufficient to account for his declaration in recording the fact, "I grew into want."

To those who would investigate the subject deeply, we recommend Laud's history of the Trial, and it will be found that he had much to say in his defence, while his opponents could not establish a single charge against him. The trial, which began November 1643, did not conclude till October the next year. The minuteness with which every detail of his long life was brought before the public,

* Guizot, p. 253.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

from his admission at Oxford to his commitment to the Tower, is perfectly marvellous.

Multiplicity of the charges.

Puritans assailed his theological character, and questioned him about his language respecting the altar, the priesthood, and the consecrated elements. This we can fully understand; we can imagine their expression of disgust when he restored the painted windows in the churches where they had been destroyed; we can imagine their assumed consternation at the books found on his table, and the pictures hanging on his walls; but our surprise is excited or increased, when his private conversations are quoted, and the discussions he held on Church matters with his theological friends. The puritans cavilled at his disposal of Church patronage, and at the favour shown towards his friends. The only question with respect to such charges as these is, what did they amount to? As he himself observes, there could be no treason in any of the charges thus brought against him; but, knowing the virulence of theological faction, we might pass over all this, and allow the puritans to adduce what could only give pain to the broken heart of the aged primate, who thought it his duty, from the station he occupied, to defend his cause. But when we read of the goldsmiths of Lombard Street and Cheapside bearing witness against him, for having as archbishop interfered with their residences; when the soap-boilers complained that on some occasions they were damaged by the king's proclamations; when we read even of one man who reviled him for calling him "sirrah," we are beyond measure astonished. The houses of the goldsmiths belonged to the Chapter of St. Paul's, and were pulled down for the improvement of the cathedral. The archbishop was obliged to admit that he could not remember whether he ever did, or did not, call Mr. Vassal "sirrah," he only affirmed that his constant habit was to call gentlemen of Mr. Vassal's dignity "sir."

The most painful part of these proceedings was the publication of his diary. We possess the diary, and it would indeed be difficult to find in any similar document so little liable to censure. But Laud naturally felt a reluctance at having recalled to mind what had been written many years before, and we think that no puritan would be found in these days to justify Prynne's conduct, in mutilating the diary and in adding to it statements most offensive.

Laud's diary used against him.

We are indebted to the celebrated Henry Wharton for the publication of the genuine diary, and the exposure of the proceedings of Prynne. As Echard remarks, his accusers descended to the most trifling actions of his life. Every personal infirmity, every indiscreet action that could be remembered, was sifted and aggravated, and the best and noblest of his performances were treated as crimes.

Works of restoration charged against him as high treason.

The archbishop's desire to restore images, pictures, and stained glass windows in churches, was represented as contrary to the statutes of Edward VI. and the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth.

The archbishop referred to the history of the primitive church to show that images were not of necessity abused to the purposes of superstition; he quoted Calvin himself as not averse to pictures of scriptural subjects.* He affirmed that historical representations were allowed in the Homilies. He asserted that he only repaired the stained windows which had been broken, and this he did not from any mass-book, but from comparing the broken fragments.

He made a distinction between the representations on the windows and the adoption of statues, and of course narrowed the circumstances to meet the existing case;

* Institut., lib. i. cap. xi. § 12.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

but he might have shown that both before and at the Reformation statues were allowed, so long as they were not abused to the purposes of superstition. He declared that he had never approved the statues of God the Father; but if the charges had been proved against him, he might well demand that his opponents should prove—which was a thing impossible—that the repairing of a glass window was an act of high treason.

His opponents admitted the logic of his defence, but contended that if the erection of stained windows was not high treason by statute, it amounted to the same thing, as it tended to subvert our religion and to introduce popery.

Consecrating churches, and placing the altar at the east end, was high treason.

The consecration of the church of St. Catherine Cree, was of course among the charges brought forward to prove him guilty of high treason; but we need not dwell upon this subject, as we have before this given his defence. The same may be said of the charge of high treason brought against him for placing the Holy table at the east end of the church.

Bowing at the Holy Name—high treason.

No explanations, however, would satisfy the accusers of the primate. From time immemorial the members of the English Church had been accustomed to bow at the Holy Name of Jesus. This was now said to encourage transubstantiation, and to encourage the doctrine of transubstantiation was high treason. The puritans affirmed that standing at the Gloria Patri was introduced with the mass, and they declaimed against the use of copes.

The charge of popery refuted by Laud.

All the minor charges the archbishop heard read without any apparent disturbance of mind; but he did not think it worth his while to place any restraint upon himself when it was stated that he had endeavoured to reconcile the Churches of England and Rome.

"I have converted," he said, "several from popery;

I have taken an oath against it; I have written a book against it; I have held a controversy against it; I have been twice offered a cardinal's hat, and refused it; I have been twice in danger of my life from a popish plot; I have endeavoured to reconcile the Lutherans and Calvinists, and therefore I have endeavoured to introduce popery!"

He admitted that he regarded the Church of Rome as a true church. "She never," he said, "erred in fundamentals, for fundamentals are in the creed, and she denies it not. Were she not a true Church it were hard with the Church of England, since from her the English bishops derive their apostolical succession. She is therefore," he continues, "a true but not an orthodox Church. Salvation may be found in her communion; and her religion and ours are one in the great essentials. I am not bound to believe each detached phrase in the Homilies, and I do not think they assert the pope to be Antichrist; yet," being on his trial, he added, "it cannot be proved that I ever denied him to be so. As to the charge of unchurching foreign protestants, I certainly said generally, according to St. Jerome, 'No bishop, no church;' and the preface to the book of ordination sets forth that the three orders came from the apostles."

Considering the circumstances under which this fearless statement was made, we must think highly of Laud's persistent courage. His opponents could only meet him by affirming that the Church of Rome was abominable, corrupt, and damnable; that its clergy were not true ministers; that, in short, it was Antichrist; and that, though he had endeavoured to suppress popery, he was nevertheless a papist.

Close of the trial.

The archbishop's trial was brought to a close on the 29th of July, 1644; it had lasted three months, and he was heard twenty days in his own defence. Whatever may

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

Laud's recapitulation.

have been the offences of the archbishop, the peers felt that they would only have stultified themselves if they found him guilty of high treason, when not a single act of high treason could be proved against him. The archbishop was permitted to make what he calls his recapitulation on the 21st of September. He thanked the peers for the patience with which they had heard him; he trusted to their justice to pronounce him innocent of crime, and to their clemency to make due allowance for the common frailties of man; he besought them to review the charges with care, and with the respect due to his rank, his age, his long imprisonment, his sufferings, and his patience in affliction.

He complained that sufficient time had not been granted him to prepare for his defence, and hoped, before sentence was pronounced, a day would be appointed for his counsel to plead.

He reminded them of the seizure of his diary and papers by Prynne, even of the book of his private prayers, though he "blessed God that there was no disloyalty in the one, nor popery in the other." He reminded them of the unjustifiable methods pursued to procure evidence against him; and yet he maintained that the charges, when produced, were general and vague. He showed that the decrees of courts and councils being the acts of other men, had been imputed to him as crimes. Among these crimes was written the repairing of St. Paul's and the reformation of the statutes of the University of Oxford. Instead of blame for his share in these transactions he had imagined that praise was his due. He complained that he had been overwhelmed by 150 witnesses, schismatics and sectaries, of whom some appeared against him three, four, or even six times, in defiance of the injunctions of the civil law, by which it is expressly declared that the judges should

so moderate things, that no man should be oppressed by the multitude of witnesses.

"And now, my lords," he said in conclusion, "I do in all humility lay myself low at God's mercy-seat, to do with me as He pleases, and, under God, I shall rely upon your lordships' justice, honour, and clemency, of which I cannot doubt. And without being further tedious to your lordships, who have with very honourable patience heard me through this long and tedious trial, I shall conclude with that which St. Augustine said to Romanianus, a man that had tried both fortunes, as well as I—'If the providence of God reaches down to us, as most certainly it doth,—sic tecum agi oportet, sicut agitur; it must be so done with thee, and so with me also, as it is done.'* And under that Providence which will, I doubt not, work to the best of the soul that loves God, I repose myself."

Conclusion of his speech to the Lords.

The archbishop's counsel were heard on the 11th of October. Their remarks had reference chiefly to the legal question.

Counsel heard.

The archbishop, after this long exertion of his mental powers, was not sorry to enjoy a few days' rest, if enjoyment, though speaking comparatively, can be predicated of a man in Laud's position. He must have been conscious of the consummate ability and intrepid bearing with which he had vindicated himself against every charge, his conduct having been such as to extort an expression of wonder and praise even from William Prynne himself. "To give him his due," said Prynne, "he made as full, as gallant, and as pithy a defence of so bad a cause, and spake so much for himself as it was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that with so much art, sophistry, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and

Prynne's praise.

* S. Aug. lib. 1, cont. Academ., cap. i.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

confidence, without the least blush of acknowledgment of guilt in anything, as argued him rather obstinate than innocent, impudent than penitent, a far better orator and sophister than Protestant or Christian, yea, a truer son of the Church of Rome than the Church of England." *

This commendation on the part of Prynne is the more remarkable, when we remember that he proclaimed Archbishop Laud to be the most execrable traitor and apostate that our English soil or the whole Christian world had ever bred; and that he was at the same time exciting the rabble of London to demand his blood.†

Laud summoned by the Commons.

On the first day of November a summons came from the House of Commons to the Lieutenant of the Tower to bring Laud to their bar, and to hear the evidence formally summed up and given against him in the House of Lords.

Laud's deference to the law and observance of precedent seem, at first, to have tempted him to resist this mandate. It was certainly not in accordance with the constitution as it then existed, or as it was afterwards settled on ancient precedents in the year 1688. He remarked—"I know no law nor custom for this, for though our votes, by a late act of parliament, be taken away, yet our baronies are not; and so long as we remain barons we belong to the Lords' House, and not to the Commons. Yet how to help myself I knew not, for when the warrant came to me the Lords' House was risen, and I was commanded to the House of Commons the next morning, before the Lords came to sit, so I could not petition them for my privilege; and had I done it, I doubt it would have been interpreted for an endeavour to make a breach between the Houses; and

* Cant. Doome, p. 462.

† The inconsistency of Prynne is remarkable. At the Restoration he was among the first to call for a restoration of the Prayer Book.

should I under any pretence refuse to go, Mr. Lieutenant would have carried me."

When, on the next day, he appeared at the bar of the House of Commons, he was informed by the Speaker that an ordinance had been drawn up to attaint him of high treason. Before passing it, they required a summary of the charge that had been brought against him to be read, and he was told that he was sent for to hear it. He solicited in vain to be assisted by his counsel and his solicitor, who were present with him in all the proceedings of the House of Lords. By direction of the Speaker, the sum of the charge against the archbishop was read by Mr. Brown.*

Attainted at the bar of high treason.

The Speaker pressed him to make an immediate answer to the charge. Laud pleaded that the charge being long and various, he wanted time to prepare himself; and again he petitioned that on legal points his counsel might be heard. He was commanded to withdraw. On his return to the bar of the House he received an order to appear on the Monday se'nnight after, to point out any things in which the report was incorrect.

He desires time for his answer.

Not a word was said of hearing his counsel.

He returned to his prison.

He felt so pleased at getting back his prayer-book, that he notifies the fact of the occurrence on Wednesday, 6th November. It had been in Prynne's hands ever since the last of May, 1643. He regained what he valued so much, through the intervention of Mr. Hern and Mr. Brown.

On Monday, the 11th of November, he appeared again before the House of Commons; and, according to their peremptory order, he delivered his answer to the summary charge which Mr. Brown had made against him.

His answer to the charges in the Commons.

* Troubles and Trial. Nov. 1. Works, vol. iv. p. 400.

The archbishop referred to details which were fully discussed in his impeachment before the House of Lords, and which that House had refused to acknowledge as proof of high treason on the part of the primate.

In addressing the Commons, he first of all thanked the House, through the Speaker, for having given him leave to speak for himself.

Proceeding with his address he said: "Secondly, I do humbly desire, if any word or thing should be mistaken or unadvisedly expressed by me, which shall be sore against my will, I may have liberty to recall and expound myself.

"Thirdly, that you will favourably consider into what straits I am cast; that, after a long and tedious hearing, I must now come to answer to a sum or epitome of the same charge, which, how dangerous it may be for me, all men that know epitomes cannot but understand."

In obedience to the will of the House, he proceeded to refute the charges brought against him, in the same order as they were made. He had carefully taken notes, "so far forth, at least, as an old slow hand could take them, a heavy heart observe them, and an old decayed memory retain them." Although the House was determined upon his death, his demeanour had its influence in securing for him at least some show of courtesy. He observed that Mr. Brown had done his duty to the House by pressing all things as hardly against him as the cause would admit; but there is a tone of gratitude in his language when he says of that gentleman—"His carriage and expressions were civil towards me in this my great affliction, and for this I render him humble and hearty thanks, having from other hands pledged my Saviour in gall and vinegar, and drunk up the cup of the scornings of the people to the very bottom."

He thus concluded: "Mr. Speaker, I shall draw towards an end; yet not forgetting what ordinance you told me was drawn up against me, if that which I have now said may any way satisfy this honourable House to make stay of it, or to mitigate it, I shall bless God and you for it. And I humbly desire you to take into consideration my calling, my age, my former life, my fall, my imprisonment, long and strict; that these considerations may move with you. In my prosperity (I bless God for it!) I was never puffed into vanity, whatever the world may think of me; and in these last full four years' durance, I thank the same God, 'gravem fortunam constanter tuli,' I have with decent constancy borne the weight of a pressing fortune, and I hope God will strengthen me unto and in the end of it.

His appeal to the House.

"Mr. Speaker, I am very aged, considering the turmoils of my life, and I daily find in myself more decays than I make show of; and the period of my life, in the course of nature, cannot be far off. It cannot but be a great grief unto me to stand at these years thus charged before you; yet give me leave to say thus much without offence: Whatsoever errors or faults I may have committed by the way in any my proceedings, through human infirmity (as who is he that hath not offended, and broken some statute laws too, by ignorance or misapprehension, or forgetfulness, at some sudden time of action?), yet if God bless me with so much memory, I will die with these words in my mouth: that I never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom; nor the bringing in of popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion established by law in this kingdom. And now, Mr. Speaker, having done with the fact, I have but this one thing to put to the consideration of

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

the honourable House. My charge hath been repeated, I confess, by a very worthy and very able gentleman. But ability is not absolute in any. The evidence given against me before the Lords was (as by the law it ought to be) given in upon oath; but the evidence now summed up and presented to this honourable House is but upon the collection and judgment of one man, how able or entire soever; and what he conceived is proved against me is but according to his judgment and memory, which perhaps may differ much from the opinion and judgment of the judges themselves who heard the evidence at large. Nor was this gentleman himself present every day of my hearing; and then for those days in which he was absent, he can report no more here than what others have reported to him. So for so much his repetition here is but a report of a report of evidence, and not upon oath.

"And I suppose never any jurors, who are triers of the fact in any case, civil or criminal, did ever ground their verdict upon an evidence only reported before them, and which themselves heard not.

"And if this manner of proceeding shall be thought less considerable in my person, yet I humbly desire it may be thoroughly weighed in the prudent judgment of the honourable House, the great preserver of the laws and liberties of the subjects of England, how far it doth or may trench upon these in future consequences, if these great boundaries be laid loose and open.

"And because my infirmities are many and great, which age and grief have added to those which are naturally in me, I most humbly desire again that my counsel may be heard for point of law, according to the former concession of this honourable House. For I assure myself upon that which hath been pleaded to the Lords, that no one, nor all of the things together, which are charged

against me, if proved (which I conceive they are not) can make me guilty of high treason by any known established law of this kingdom.

"The sum of all is this: upon an impeachment arising from this House I have pleaded not guilty. Thereupon issue hath been joined, and evidence given in upon oath. And now I must humbly leave it to you, your wisdom and justice, whether it shall be thought fit and just and honourable to judge me here only upon a report, or a hearsay, and that not upon oath."

Weariness of Laud.

We are not surprised to hear that after his long speech, or rather succession of speeches, the archbishop felt exceedingly faint, and for almost a fortnight afterwards endured pain and "soreness in his breast," which gradually wore away.

Mr. Brown's reply to Laud's appeal.

On the 13th of November he was again at the bar of the House of Commons, to hear Mr. Brown's reply to his answer.

This reply was full of mistakes, but the archbishop understood that a rejoinder would not be permitted. The archbishop was dismissed, and had no sooner quitted the bar than the House called for the ordinance, and without hearing his counsel, voted him guilty of high treason.

Vote of high treason.

On Saturday the 16th of November this ordinance was transmitted to the Lords, and a debate was fixed for the following Friday.

Violent language in the House of Lords.

The Earl of Pembroke, who had been under obligations to Laud, showed his gratitude, or that he had taken some offence not discoverable by the archbishop, by the violent and coarse language which he used. He called the archbishop a "rascal" and a "villain," and warned their lordships that they would be mobbed by the Londoners, and justice be demanded at their hands, as in Lord Strafford's case. The Lords evidently demurred

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

to this violation of justice, but they were urged to despatch by messages from the Commons.*

Brown was guilty of handing in a garbled statement of what took place in the House of Commons.

Laud voted guilty in the House of Lords.

At length, on the 17th of December, Laud's case was again brought before the House of Lords, fourteen peers only being present. He was voted guilty of endeavouring to subvert the laws, to overthrow the Protestant religion, and to act as an enemy to parliament.

The judges declare Laud not guilty of treason.

It was put to the judges whether this were treason or not. The judges unanimously declared that nothing which was charged against him was treason by any known and established law of the land.

Christmas Day arrived, and was kept as a most solemn fast. After certain messages and conferences, the attainder was ratified on the 4th of January, and it was decreed that the archbishop should suffer death as a traitor.

The attainder ratified.

The 10th of January was fixed upon as the day for his execution. In the House of Lords six peers only attended when the sentence was pronounced.

A pardon sent by the king.

The king, well informed of the great danger of his primate and friend, sent him secretly from Oxford a full pardon, signed and sealed with the Great Seal of England. This was the cause of much consolation to the archbishop; for although he did not expect the pardon to be received by the House of Commons, it was joy to him to receive such a testimony of the king's affection and care for his devoted servant.

When, according to form, the archbishop was asked

* On the 26th of November the Lord Admiral reported to the House, "That the committee, after much debate, thought fit to return the ordinance for the archbishop's attainder to the House again, as a thing fit to be debated by the whole House." But on the 28th a message was sent up from the Commons, demanding instant sentence.

what he could say why he should not suffer death, he made answer that he had the king's gracious pardon, which he pleaded and tendered to them, desiring that it might be allowed. Of this document, it appears, no notice was taken by either House. The primate had from the beginning foreseen this end of his troubles, and his defence had reference, not to the saving of his life, but to what he regarded as the dignity of the office he held.

No notice taken of the royal pardon.

When the passing of the ordinance had been signified to him by the Lieutenant of the Tower, he received the intelligence with dignified composure. He was neither ashamed to live, nor afraid to die. But he certainly was moved when he was informed that he had been condemned to die on the gibbet.

Condemned to death on the gibbet.

The idea itself was a cruel one, for, under the excited feelings of the rabble, he might have been torn limb from limb on his way to the place of execution.

But Laud felt the indignity which, in his person, would thus be offered to the primate of all England. So deeply did he feel this, that he condescended to offer a petition to parliament that the sentence might be changed to beheading. This being so reasonable a request, was granted by the Lords, though violently opposed at first in the Commons. At length his desire was obtained. Another request was only partially granted. He desired the attendance of his chaplains, Dr. Sterne, Dr. Haywood, and Dr. Martin.*

His request to be beheaded.

The Commons would only permit the attendance of Dr. Sterne; and instead of the other two chaplains, they appointed two violent presbyterians, Marshall and Palmer, to give him religious consolation. This consolation his grace quietly declined. We can easily understand that when it was signified to the archbishop that his trial had

His request to have the ministrations of his chaplains.

* Works, vol. iv. p. 423.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633-45.

come to a conclusion, he found that rest and peace which, in conducting his defence, he could only obtain in his hours of devotion.

He now felt that, with a dignity acknowledged by his opponents, and a humility which almost won their sympathy, he had maintained the cause of a primate of all England. For death he was prepared; it must come soon. He had the last earthly satisfaction in being permitted to feel that he had averted an indignity designed to be offered to his office, and in his person to the hierarchy of England. He desired the attendance of his chaplains, not only to assist him in the last solemn acts of his life, but as witnesses of what he should do or say. From the conduct of Prynne, he had reason to fear that his conduct at the last would be misrepresented.

He would not trust himself to an extempore speech on the scaffold, but he carefully wrote down what he intended to say; and if no other friend were permitted to approach him, he had Dr. Sterne at hand, to prove that he died in the true faith, a servant and soldier of the great Captain of our salvation.

Warrant for execution.

On the evening of the 9th, Sheriff Chambers brought the warrant for his execution. Laud expected it, and it made no impression upon his spirits. He wished to keep up his strength, that he might bear with courage what he was the next day to endure.

Laud's preparation.

He partook of a moderate supper, and then retired to rest. His sleep was the sound sleep of a man relieved from a burden, and he did not awake till the time came for his servants to attend his rising.

In the morning he was early at his prayers, and he continued his devotions until Pennington, Lieutenant of the Tower, with other public officers, came to conduct him to the scaffold. His countenance was cheerful and

he seemed as one, said a contemporary, who came not there to die, but to be translated.

The orderly mind of Laud doubtless expected that he should receive the same treatment as had been accorded to his predecessors in suffering. He was not prepared for the rudeness of some of the puritans, as he passed on his way to the scaffold. But their opprobrious language neither discomposed his thoughts nor disturbed his patience. He had been taught in the school of Christ, and when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not, but committed his cause to Him that judgeth righteously.

At the scaffold.

He found the platform, on which the block was placed, filled with people who placed themselves upon the theatre to behold the tragedy. The archbishop said, "I thought there would have been an empty scaffold, that I might have had room to die. I beseech you let me have an end of this misery, for I have endured it long."

Sufficient room was at length made to let him pass, but he perceived that the scaffold was so rudely put together that there were broad chinks between the boards of which it was composed. He saw that some people stood in the very place beneath the block. He asked either that the people might be removed, or else that dust should be brought to fill up the crevices, "lest," said he, "my innocent blood should fall on the heads of the people." Among those who stood on the scaffold to look and to rail, was Sir John Clotworthy, a follower of the Earl of Warwick. He was roused to anger at seeing the archbishop unmoved by the revilings of the people. He propounded questions to him, not as if wishing to learn, but rudely and roughly, so as to expose him to his associates.

Questions put to Laud on the scaffold by a persecutor.

"What," he asked, "is the comfortablest saying which a dying man would have in his mouth?"

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

The archbishop, with much meekness, answered, "Cupio dissolvi et esse cum Christo."

"That is a good desire," said the persecutor, "but there must be a foundation for that divine assurance."

"No man can express it," replied Laud; "it is to be found within."

"It is founded upon a word nevertheless," said Clotworthy, "and that word should be known."

"That word," said the archbishop, "is the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and that alone."

The archbishop perceived the insult which these questions were intended to convey, and turned away from his inquisitor.

At length he found the means of addressing the bystanders, and he read from a paper which was after his death presented to King Charles at Oxford:—

Laud's last sermon.

"Good people, this is an uncomfortable time to preach, yet I shall begin with a text of Scripture, Hebrews xii. 2. 'Let us run with patience the race which is set before us: looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

"I have been long in my race, and how I have looked unto Jesus, the author and finisher of my faith, He best knows. I am now come to the end of my race, and here I find the cross, a death of shame. But the shame must be despised, or no coming to the right hand of God. Jesus despised the shame for me, and God forbid that I should not despise the shame for Him. I am going apace, as you see, towards the Red sea, and my feet are upon the very brink of it: an argument, I hope, that God is bringing me into the land of promise; for that was the way through which He led His people.

"But before they came to it, He instituted a passover for them. A lamb it was, but it must be eaten with sour herbs. I shall obey, and labour to digest the sour herbs, as well as the lamb. And I shall remember it is the Lord's passover. I shall not think of the herbs, nor be angry with the hands that gathered them: but look up only to Him who instituted that, and governed these: for men can have no more power over me than what is given them from above.

"I am not in love with this passage through the Red sea, for I have the weakness and infirmity of flesh and blood plentifully in me.

"And I have prayed, with my Saviour, 'ut transire calix iste,' that this cup of red wine might pass from me. But if not, God's will, not mine, be done. And I shall most willingly drink of this cup as deep as He pleases and enter into this sea, yea, and pass through it, in the way that He shall lead me. . . . . .

"And as for this people, they are at this day miserably misled: God of His mercy open their eyes, that they may see the right way. For at this day the blind lead the blind, and if they go on, both will certainly fall into the ditch.

"And though I am not only the first archbishop, but the first man, that ever died by an ordinance in parliament, yet some of my predecessors have gone this way, though not by this means. For Elphegus was hurried away and lost his head by the Danes; and Simon Sudbury in the fury of Wat Tyler and his fellows. Before these, St. John Baptist had his head danced off by a lewd woman; and St. Cyprian, archbishop of Carthage, submitted his head to a persecuting sword. Many examples great and good; and they teach me patience. For I hope my cause in heaven will look of another dye than the colour that is put upon it here.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

"And some comfort it is to me, not only that I go the way of these great men in their several generations, but also that my charge, as foul as it is made, looks like that of the Jews against St. Paul; for he was accused for the law and the temple, *i.e.* religion; and like that of St. Stephen, for breaking the ordinances which Moses gave, *i.e.* law and religion, the holy place and the law.

"But you will then say, Do I then compare myself with the integrity of St. Paul and St. Stephen? No: far be that from me. I only raise a comfort to myself, that these great saints and servants of God were laid at, in their times, as I am now."

He observed that the multiplied sectarian divisions had produced such a harvest to the pope as had never been known in England since the Reformation. He vindicated the character of the king, who was accused of a tendency to popery. "On my conscience," he said, "I know him to be as guiltless of this charge as any man now living. I hold that he is as sound a Protestant, according to the religion by law established, as any man in his dominions; and that no one would more freely venture his life in defence of it."

He lamented the condition of the Church of England, which had become like a cloak cleft into shivers, with wedges made of its own body, and at every cleft profaneness and irreligion was rushing in.

He disclaimed any intention, on his own part, of introducing arbitrary power into the Constitution, or papacy into the Church.

His conclusion is very affecting. "The last particular," he said, "for I am not willing to be too long, is myself. I was born and baptized in the bosom of the Church of England, established by law: in that profession I have ever since lived, and in that I come now to die. What clamours and slanders I have endured for labouring to

keep uniformity in the external service of God, according to the doctrine and discipline of this Church, all men know, and I have abundantly felt.

"Now, at last, I am accused of high treason in parliament, a crime which my soul ever abhorred. This treason was charged to consist of two parts: an endeavour to subvert the laws of the land, and a like endeavour to overthrow the true Protestant religion established by law. Besides my answers to the several charges I protested mine innocency in both Houses.

"It was said, 'prisoners' protestations at the bar must not be taken.' I can bring witness of my heart, and the intentions thereof; therefore I must come to my protestation, not at the bar, but my protestation, at this hour of my death; in which I hope all men will be such charitable Christians as not to think I would die and dissemble, being instantly to give God an account for the truth of it.

"I do therefore here in the presence of God and His holy angels, take it upon my death, that I never endeavoured the subversion either of law or religion, and I desire you all to remember this protest of mine for my innocency in this, and from all treasons whatsoever.

"I have been accused likewise as an enemy to parliaments. No: I understand them, and the benefit that comes by them, too well to be so. But I did mislike the misgovernments of some parliaments many ways, and I had good reason for it. For, *corruptio optimi est pessima.* And that being the highest court, over which no other hath jurisdiction, when it is misinformed or misgoverned the subject is left without all remedy.

"But I have done. I forgive all the world, all and every of those bitter enemies which have persecuted me; and humbly desire to be forgiven of God first, and then of every man. And so I heartily desire you to join in prayer with me.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

His prayer.

"O eternal God and merciful Father, look down upon me in mercy, in the riches and fulness of all thy mercies. Look upon me, but not till Thou hast nailed my sins to the Cross of Christ; not till Thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ; not till I have hid myself in the wounds of Christ; that so the punishment due unto my sins may pass over me. And since Thou art pleased to try me to the uttermost, I most humbly beseech Thee, give me now in this great instant, full patience, proportionable comfort, and a heart ready to die for Thine honour, the king's happiness, and this Church's preservation. And my zeal to this (far from arroganc, be it spoken) is all the sin (human frailty excepted, and all incidents thereto) which is yet known to me, in this particular, for which I come now to suffer. I say, in this particular of treason. But otherwise, my sins are many and great; Lord, pardon them all, and those especially (whatever they are) which have drawn down this present judgment upon me. And when Thou hast given me strength to bear it, do with me as seems best in Thine own eyes; and carry me through death, that I may look upon it, in what visage soever it shall appear to me. Amen.

"And that there may be a stop of this issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom, O Lord, I beseech Thee give grace and repentance to all bloodthirsty people. But if they will not repent, O Lord, confound all their devices, defeat and frustrate all their designs and endeavours upon them, which are or shall be contrary to the glory of Thy great Name, the truth and sincerity of religion, the establishment of the king, and his posterity after him, in their just rights and privileges; the honour and conservation of parliaments in their just power; the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace, and patrimony; and the settlement of this distracted and distressed people, under their ancient laws, and in their

native liberty. And when Thou hast done all this in mere mercy for them, O Lord, fill their hearts with thankfulness, and with religious, dutiful obedience to Thee and Thy commandments all their days.

CHAP. XXXVII. William Laud. 1633–45.

"So, Amen, Lord Jesus, Amen. And receive my soul into Thy bosom. Amen.

"Our Father, &c."

He deprecated a false report of his last words.

After he had delivered a copy of this prayer to his chaplain Dr. Stern, he observed a person, whose name was Hinde, taking down his speech; turning to him, he said, "Friend, I beseech you hear me. I cannot say I have spoken every word as it is in my paper, but I have gone very near it, to help my memory as well as I could. But I beseech you let me have no wrong done me;" intimating that he ought not to publish an imperfect copy. "Sir," replied Hinde, "you shall not; if I do so let it fall on my own head. I pray God have mercy on your soul." "I thank you," said the archbishop; I did not speak with any jealousy, as if you would do so, but only as a poor man going out of the world. It is not possible for me to keep to the words of my paper, and a phrase might do me wrong." Though evidently awed by his serenity, the rude people pressed upon him to the very block. He made the best of his way to the executioner, and putting some money into his hand, he said with a cheerful countenance, "Here, honest friend; God forgive thee, as I do, and do thine office upon me in mercy." He knelt down. The executioner whispered to him, to give a sign when the blow should come. The archbishop answered, "I will, but first let me fit myself." As he kneeled by the block, he continued in prayer.

His last prayer.

"Lord, I am coming as fast as I can. I know I must pass through the shadow of death, before I can come to see Thee. But it is but *umbra mortis*, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but Thou by Thy

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

merits and passion hast broken through the jaws of death. So, Lord, receive my soul, and have mercy upon me; and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood amongst them, for Jesus Christ His sake, if it be Thy will."

Beheaded.

Then he bowed his head upon the block, "down, as upon a bed," and prayed silently awhile. No man heard what it was that he now said. He cried aloud, "Lord, receive my soul." This was the sign to the executioner, and at one blow William Laud was beheaded.

In a leaden coffin his body was borne to the grave, and was interred in the church of All Hallows, Barking, near the Tower.

Although the ordinance for the suppression of the Liturgy had now been passed, his enemies had forgotten to interpose at this time, and to the comfort of multitudes who followed his body to the grave, the funeral service was solemnised according to the formularies of the Church.

It had been Laud's wish that his dust might repose within the walls of his much-loved college, and this desire was eventually accomplished; for after the Restoration his remains were transferred to the Chapel of St. John's, and there deposited beneath the altar, close by the bones of Sir Thomas White, the munificent founder of the institution.

His remains laid in St. John's College.

The fact just stated confirms the conclusion at which we have already arrived, that brusque as his manner may have been, and rough as may have been his conduct towards those who opposed him, Laud had nevertheless many friends who had sympathised with him in his distress and trial, and the majority of the people were with him, though they had not power to defend him against the enthusiasts.

I have always abstained from attempting to give a character of any of the many primates on whose biography I have been so long engaged. I have observed, that in such judgments of character we have the surmises of the historian, rather than the real opinions of the subject of his history. The historian takes up a theory and bends facts to the support of it. I give the facts, I believe, fairly; this at least is my intention and endeavour. The reader will draw his own conclusions, and these conclusions will be influenced more or less by his prejudices. But in regard to every character, we may require, that the person characterised shall be judged by the principles in vogue during his own age; and he may afterwards be brought into comparison with persons in other ages who, with the same principles, under different circumstances, have surpassed his excellences, or fallen short of the virtues by which he may have finally triumphed. That Laud was despotic no one will deny, but he exerted his powers not to exceed but to enforce the law upon those who had sworn to its observance. We can imagine a primate equally a despot in disposition, who, in waging war with a party against whom he had formed a prejudice, instead of being contented with the law as it stands, seeking by a new act of parliament to increase his own temporal power, and thus to betray the independency of the Church. We can imagine a primate—who, born and bred a presbyterian, has been led by circumstances to conform to the Church, to be oblivious of his solemn ordination vow, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine." We can suppose him to co-operate with the propagators of these same erroneous and strange doctrines, which every bishop is pledged both privately and openly to oppose. Laud, on the contrary, boasted that he was born and bred in the Church, and the cause of the Church he died to sustain.

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

He did not nullify the Creed by regarding as "the Holy Catholic Church" a gathering together of discordant sects, to express a belief in the existence of which is a mere unmeaning trui m; but he believed that Christ, his Master, had established that one Church mentioned in the Creed, a kingdom upon earth, of which there are many colonies, some of them in much need of reformation. Among these colonies, the Church of England, as established by Augustine, is one, and the only one, as Laud thought, rightly reformed. He is accused of thus unchurching the sects of human foundation, Calvinism, Presbyterianism, and others. But it was a fact, whether he asserted or denied it, that they were unchurched; and this is a question elsewhere to be discussed.

Of the munificence of Laud, and of his incessant labours to enrich, not his family, but the Church and its Universities, we have had occasion to make mention, and shall have further opportunities to speak.

Laud's will.

In his last will and testament Laud says:

"For my faith, I die, as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, foreshadowed by the prophets and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed apostles, and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, as it stands established by law. I leave my body to the earth whence it was taken, in full assurance of the resurrection of it from the grave at the last day; this resurrection, I constantly believe, my dear Saviour Jesus Christ will make happy unto me, His poor weary servant. As for my burial, though I stand not much upon the place, yet, if it conveniently may be, I desire to be buried in the Chapel of St. John Baptist's College in Oxford, underneath the altar or communion table there; and should I be so unhappy as to die a prisoner, yet my

earnest desire is that I may not be buried in the Tower; but wheresoever my burial shall be, that it may not waste any of the poor means which I leave behind me to better uses."

His chief bequests were as follows:—

1st. The sum of 800*l.* towards the repair of St. Paul's, if that work should be continued. Anticipating the treatment he was about to receive, he seems to have paid this sum during his lifetime to the keeping of some trustee, with a view to its application to this great object.

2nd. He says: "I take the boldness to give to my dread and dear sovereign King Charles, whom God bless, one thousand pounds, and I do forgive him the debt which he owes me, being two thousand pounds, and require that the tallies thereof be given up."

3rd. He bequeaths to St. John's College, his chapel plate, furniture, and books, together with five hundred pounds, to be invested in the purchase of land, for an increase of the income of fellows and scholars.

With modest reference to his princely benefactions as regards the members of his college, he adds, "I have done for them already according to my ability, and God's everlasting blessing be on that place and that society for ever."

4th. He bequeathed 1,800*l.* to his servants and friends in humbler walks of life.

5th. He desired 100*l.* to be laid aside for the purpose of procuring a translation into Latin of his book against Fisher, "that the Christian world might see and judge of his religion."

As his property was confiscated before his death, his will is chiefly serviceable as throwing a light upon his character. The concluding words of that document are: "Thus I forgive all the world, and heartily desire forgiveness of God and the world. And so again I commend

CHAP. XXXVII.

William Laud. 1633–45.

and commit my soul into the hands of God the Father Who gave it; in the merits and mercies of our Saviour Christ Who redeemed it; and in the peace and comfort of the Holy Ghost Who blessed it; and in the truth and unity of His Holy Catholic Church, and in communion with the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law." *

We may not here omit—what would have gratified Laud, had he lived—the statements made by two of his contemporaries.

*The testimony of the Reverend Mr. Jonathan Whiston, concerning the opinion had of the Archbishop at Rome; and with what joy the news of his death and suffering were there received.*

I do remember that being chaplain to the Honourable Sir Lionel Tolmach, Baronet, about the year 1666, I heard him relate, to some person of quality, how that in his younger days he was at Rome, and well acquainted with a certain abbot; which abbot asked him whether he had heard any news from England? He answered, no. The abbot replied, I will tell you then some; Archbishop Laud is beheaded. Sir Lionel answered, You are sorry for that, I presume. The abbot replied again, That they had more cause to rejoice, that the greatest enemy of the Church of Rome in England was cut off, and the greatest champion of the Church of England silenced; or in words to that purpose.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand, this 28th day of September, 1694.

JONA. WHISTON, *Vicar of Bethersden, in Kent.*

*The testimony of the learned and worthy John Evelyn, Esq., Fellow of the Royal Society, concerning the same matter.*

I was at Rome, in company of divers of the English

* Troubles and Trial, Works, p. 450. Harl. MSS., 4115.

fathers, when the news of the archbishop's sufferings, and a copy of his sermon made upon the scaffold, came thither. They read the sermon, and commented upon it with no small satisfaction and contempt: and looked upon him as one that was a great enemy to them, and stood in their way; whilst one of the blackest crimes imputed to him was his being popishly affected.

JOHN EVELYN.*

I cannot refrain from quoting, in conclusion, the words of my honoured friend, the late Poet Laureate:

> Prejudged by foes determined not to spare,
> An old weak man for vengeance thrown aside,
> Laud "in the painful art of dying" tried
> (Like a poor bird entangled in a snare
> Whose heart still flutters, though his wings forbear
> To stir in useless struggle) hath relied
> On hope that conscious innocence supplied,
> And in his prison breathes celestial air.
> Why tarries then thy chariot? Wherefore stay,
> O Death! the ensanguined yet triumphant wheels,
> Which thou prepar'st, full often to convey
> (What time a state with madding faction reels)
> The saint or patriot to the world that heals
> All wounds, all perturbations doth allay? †

* Laud's Works, iv. 504. It is not necessary to give a history of Laud's works; for they will be found collected and admirably edited in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.

† Wordsworth.

# CHAPTER XXXVIII.

## WILLIAM JUXON.—TO THE DEATH OF THE KING.

Born at Chichester—Educated at Merchant Taylors School, and St. John's, Oxford.—Studies law.—Ordained.—Vicar of St. Giles', Oxford.—Rector of Somerton.—President of St. John's.—Reforms statutes of the University.—Prebendary of Chichester.—Clerk of the Closet.—Dean of the Chapel Royal.—Elected to the See of Hereford.—Bishop of London.—Sworn of the Privy Council.—Present from Merchant Taylors.—Lord Treasurer.—Advice to the king in Strafford's case.—Scotch Prayer Book.—Resigns treasurership.—King consults Juxon.—Sends for him at his trial.—King's last moments.—Books sent to his children.—Lesson for the day.—"Remember."—Royal funeral.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

THERE are some persons who obtain a high position in society, and establish a distinguished character in history, not so much from the exhibition of talent and learning, as from the fact of their being free from notable faults, and by performing with undeviating respectability the duties which they have not sought, but which by circumstances have devolved upon them. Such a character was William Juxon. He maintained with firmness but with mildness, the dignity of the episcopate, with impartial justice the character of a statesman, and with unshaken constancy the warmth of friendship. His charity was

*Authorities.*—Wood's Athenæ and History and Antiquities of the University of Oxon., Fasti.—Le Neve.—Lloyd's "Memoirs of those that suffered from 1637 to 1660."—Peter Heylyn's Cyprianus Anglicus.—Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion.—Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.—Hacket's Life of Williams.—Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon, with a sketch of his parish of Little Compton, published by the Rev. W. H. Marah.—Wilson's History of Merchant Taylors.

extensive without ostentation, his religion fervent without superstition.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

William Juxon was born in the year 1582, in the parish of St. Peter the Great, known also as sub-deanery parish, in the city of Chichester.* The family of Juxon resided in London, and appears to have been closely connected with the great Company of Merchant Taylors. But one of the branches of the family had been for some time connected with Chichester. Thomas Juxon, of Godstone, suffered for his religion at Chichester in 1557.

Birth of Juxon.

Parentage and early education.

Richard, the father of the archbishop, was receiver-general of the Bishop of Chichester's estates. From an early period of life, however, William Juxon ceased to have an immediate interest in the city of Chichester.

The interest of the family in the Merchant Taylors Company procured for him a nomination to their school in London. From Merchant Taylors School he removed to St. John's College, Oxford, first, perhaps, as a commoner, with an exhibition, though he certainly was elected Fellow in 1598. His first intention was evidently to adopt the law as his profession. Having taken the degree of Bachelor of Law, in July 1603, he was about that time admitted a student at Gray's Inn. His knowledge of the law must have been one of his many recommendations to the notice of Archbishop Laud, when the

* By some persons the claim has been made in behalf of Albourne, in Sussex, as the birthplace of Juxon; there seems to be no solid foundation for this claim. In the first mention of his donations in his will was the gift of 100*l.* to St. Peter the Great, in the city of Chichester; and I have before me a copy of the registers of that parish, in which the baptism of William Juxon is recorded in October 1582. He registered himself when appointed president of St. John's College, Oxford, as William Juxon, born at Chichester. The estate of Albourne belonged to the Juxons, Albourne Place having been erected by John Juxon, or, as Cartwright in the Rape of Bramber asserts, by the archbishop himself. Yet this purchase was not made till 1626.

CHAP. XXXVIII

primate desired to select an ecclesiastic for a high office in the state.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

Whether any success attended his legal studies we know not. We find him in 1609 in Holy Orders, and

Admitted to Holy Orders.

vicar of St. Giles', Oxford. Here he officiated for six years, and, according to Wood, was much admired for

Vicar of St. Giles'.

"his plain and improving style of preaching." *

Rector of Somerton.

From St. Giles' he was removed to Somerton, in Oxfordshire, of which parish he became rector. His coat of arms in the east window of the church attests the fact.

President of St. John's, 1621.

When Dr. Laud was advanced to the bishopric of St. David's, Juxon was appointed, on Laud's recommendation, to be his successor as president of St. John's. The election took place on 29th of November, 1621, and on the 12th of December following he proceeded to the degree of D.C.L. In the years 1626 and 1627, he was vice-

Appointed to revise the statutes.

chancellor of the university. He was persuaded to devote his sound judgment and unimpassioned zeal to a review of those old and obsolete statutes which Laud had determined to reform. The ancient statutes of the university had become so confused, that, to make a digest of them so as to form one connected body, became absolutely necessary. But although encouraged by the Earl of Pembroke the chancellor, Juxon made very little progress in his labours till the year 1630. At that time Laud had become chancellor, and new life and vigour were instantly imparted to the proceeding. A committee of doctors and masters was appointed to revise and remodel the statutes; and, it is added by Wood, to their labours we are indebted for the statutes in use.†

Prebendary of Chichester.

Juxon was at this time a prebendary of Chichester, being soon after made chaplain to his majesty, and Dean of Wor-

* Wood's Athenæ, ii. col. 1144.

† Wood's Annals, ii. pp. 366, 370, 385.

cester. Laud, who had now become Bishop of London, recommended Juxon to be clerk of his majesty's closet. He admitted that he appointed one in whom he had entire confidence to that important and delicate office, that, if he grew weak or infirm, he might have a friend whom he could trust near his majesty's person. This appointment was made in 1632, and early in 1633 he not only became Dean of the Chapel Royal, but he was nominated and duly elected to the Bishopric of Hereford. But before he was consecrated, the See of London became vacant by the translation of Laud to Canterbury. The new primate recommended the appointment of Juxon to be his successor, and he was sworn one of his majesty's privy council. By his union of firmness of principle with that suavity of manner in which his patron Laud had been deficient, he won golden opinions from all sorts of men. The guild of Merchant Taylors were so pleased with the elevation of one of their scholars to the See of London, that in 1634 they presented to his lordship a basin and ewer of silver, of the value of a hundred nobles, "as a token of their love."

William Juxon, 1660–63.

Clerk of the Closet.

Dean of Chapel Royal.

Elected to See of Hereford.

Translated before consecrated to London.

One of the privy council.

Present from Merchant Taylors.

Laud having himself been appointed one of the commissioners of the treasury, soon made himself acquainted with the secrets and mysteries of the office. He found that the king had been grossly defrauded, and that, of late years, several treasurers had raised themselves from inferior positions to large estates and the title of earls. He determined, therefore, to recommend, as lord treasurer, a man who, having no family to raise, no wife and children to provide for, might manage the public income to the advantage of king and country. The appointment of Bishop Juxon to the office of treasurer increased the ill-will towards Laud, his patron, with which he was already regarded by the courtiers. He would have provided for his present repose and for future contingencies, if he had employed his

Abuses of the Treasury.

Juxon Lord Treasurer.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

power to commend the staff to the Earls of Bedford, or Hertford, or Sussex, or the Lord Saye; but he preferred the king's advantage to his private convenience, and the safety of the public to his own. So far Laud must be praised, and he evidently congratulated himself on finding a prelate to hold a secular office under the government. He thought that by so doing he strengthened the Church, which, in point of fact, he weakened. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive or make allowance for the change which had taken place in public opinion. Bishops had, in the Middle Ages, become great men by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that the bishops had formerly holden secular offices through the necessity of the case, and because there was not a sufficient number of the laity qualified or willing to discharge duties not connected with the feudal system; he did not perceive that the fact itself, even when necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with the divine calling and spiritual duties of the episcopate. In Laud's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for offices of state, and the appointment of the clergy to secular duties gave just offence. It led the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their respective dioceses. Nevertheless, whatever may have been the aspirations, feeling, and policy of Archbishop Laud, Bishop Juxon was in 1625 appointed to the post of Lord High Treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the primate himself. On the first day of the next term Bishop Juxon was conducted in great state from London house to Westminster Hall. The Archbishop of Canterbury rode at his side, and most of the lords and bishops

about town, with many gentlemen of chief note and quality, followed by two and two.*

Juxon retained his popularity, and even Lord Falkland, when attacking him in the Long Parliament, bore testimony to him that, "in an unexpected place and power he expressed an equal moderation and humility, being neither ambitious before nor proud after, either of a crosier or the white staff." Sir Philip Warwick, who knew Juxon well, says of him: "This reverend prelate was of a meek spirit, and of solid and steady judgment, and having addicted his first studies to the civil law, from which he took his title of doctor, though he afterwards took on him the ministry, this fitted him the more for secular and state affairs. His temper and prudence wrought so upon all men, that though he had the two most invidious characters both in the ecclesiastical and civil state, one of a bishop, the other of a lord treasurer, yet neither drew envy on him, though the humour of the times tended to brand all great men in those employments. In the year 1635, this good and judicious man had the white staff put into his hand, and though he found the revenue low and much anticipated, yet without meeting with times peaceable and regular, and his master inclined to be frugal, he held up the dignity and honour of his majesty's household and the splendour of the court, and all public expenses, and justice in all contracts. So as there was as few dissatisfactions in his time as perchance in any; yet he cleared off the anticipations of the revenue and set his master beforehand."

In 1641, the disturbances of the country having now commenced, Juxon resigned his treasurer's staff. If anything were required to justify his appointment, the fact might be produced that, during the five years he

* Cyp. Ang., p. 286.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

occupied the office of treasurer, he had by his prudent management lodged in the exchequer no less a sum than 900,000*l.* This simple statement is sufficient to justify Laud in the appointment of Juxon, for it shows how monstrous the former peculations must have been.*

Even when Juxon was out of office the king was still accustomed to consult him in his difficulties; though he regarded him as a casuist rather than as a statesman.

"I remember," says Sir Philip Warwick, "that the king being busy despatching some letters with his own pen, commanded me to wait on the bishop and bring him back to him his opinion of a certain affair. I humbly prayed his majesty that I might rather bring him with me, lest I should not express his majesty's sense fully, or bring back his so significantly as he meant it, and because there might be need for him further to explain himself, and lest he should not speak freely to me. To which the king replied, 'If he will speak freely to anybody, he will speak freely to you. This,' the king said, 'I will say of him, I never got his opinion freely in my life but, when I had it, I was the better for it.'" †

It would have been well for the king if he had always acted in deference to the honest advice of Juxon, especially on one memorable occasion. When the parliament tendered to Charles the two bills for the attainder of the Earl of Strafford, the king was sorely perplexed as to the course he ought to pursue. Laud was in the Tower, and the king sought advice of the judges and several of the bishops. His counsellors, urged on by the selfish queen, pressed him to comply with the votes of the parliament, alleging that no other expedient would appease the populace, now infuriated by demagogues to the very

* Coke's Detection, i. pp. 3–4.

† Warwick's Memoirs, pp. 95, 96. Clarendon's History, i. p. 210.

verge of madness. This was the decision of the judges, and from their advice the bishops then present had not courage to shrink. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, made a jesuitical distinction between a private and a public conscience, whatever that might mean. When the question was put to Juxon, he, in his usual straightforward manner, told the king that he ought not, upon any consideration in the world, to do anything against his conscience; that if he were not satisfied of Strafford's guilt, he ought not to give his assent to the bill of attainder. Juxon's advice was not taken, and the king's cause was ruined, his peace of mind was for ever gone. He carried in him, even to the block, a wounded conscience.

Juxon's honest advice to the king.

Although he was Bishop of London, Juxon was one of the three English bishops to whom the supervision of the Scotch Liturgy was commended by the king. Juxon had taken no part in the proceedings. He probably, like Laud, objected to the proposed measure, being desirous to see one law established in the three kingdoms, and in each kingdom the same Prayer Book.

Notwithstanding the unpopularity of his principles, Juxon still retained a hold on the kind feelings even of his opponents. This is the more to be remarked, since the friend with whom, under Laud, he had incessantly acted, Wren, Bishop of Ely, had, in July 1642, been impeached by the Commons.

The progress of the Rebellion was now rapid, but its narrative must be sought for in the pages of the general historian. The king grew weaker; and, a good understanding existing between the two Houses, the parliament became stronger. In 1646 an ordinance was made by which the name, dignity, and function of all archbishops and bishops were abolished; their lands were alienated, to be vested in trustees or to be sold to meet the public expenses. The king's affairs becoming more perplexed

CHAP. XXXVIII.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

his majesty consulted Bishop Juxon; and many loyal persons met at Fulham, where moderate counsels seemed to have prevailed. But other meetings were held by a different class of men, by whose counsels the revolution was accelerated.

In 1648 the king was in the Isle of Wight. He had escaped from Hampton Court, not, probably, without the knowledge of his keepers, and was made prisoner by the governor of the island, who, in all likelihood, expected his arrival. The king was entertained by hopes that a treaty might be effected between him and the parliament. As questions of conscience arose, he wished to be attended by some of his divines; among these were Juxon and Sheldon, both of them afterwards Archbishops of Canterbury. We need hardly pause to observe that the concessions of the king were not considered satisfactory by the puritan party, and that the treaty came to nothing.*

Summoned to attend the king at Westminster.

During the anxieties of the king at Hurst, we do not hear anything of Bishop Juxon; but on the removal of his majesty to the metropolis, he was summoned by the king, and on the 21st of January 1649, he waited upon him at Westminster, "to the no small refreshing of his spirit," as the king said, "in that his uncomfortable condition." It was Sunday, and the greater part of the day was passed in prayer and spiritual conversation. The bishop daily waited upon his majesty throughout the week.†

It was on the 20th January that Charles was brought before the High Court assembled to give an appearance of legality to his execution. He had been lodged at St. James's, and was taken to Westminster Hall in a sedan-chair. The court was adjourned on the following Monday, when the king denied its authority. The next sitting was on the 23rd of January, when, in spite of the soldiers by whom the king was surrounded, and their cries

* Warwick's Memoirs, p. 321; Collier, Book ix. pt. 2.

† Herbert, p. 162.

of "Justice!" "Execution!" there were evident symptoms that the intimidated masses sympathised with their king; and various communications from foreign powers were addressed to the judges. Irritated and perplexed by the circumstances just mentioned, the court determined that the king should only appear before them once again; then and there to receive his sentence. The king desired to have a conference in the Painted Chamber with the Committee of Lords and Commons, before the court proceeded any further. The court withdrew, and the king himself retired to Cotton House, where, with Bishop Juxon, he pursued his private devotions and reading for about an hour. A knock was made upon the door, when Colonel Hacker gave notice that the court was set. There was this day much disturbance during the trial, if trial it can be called. The king's request for a conference was denied him on the ground of his refusing to acknowledge the legal jurisdiction of the court. Bradshaw pronounced the sentence, introducing it with a long speech, stern and bitter, but free from personal insult. The king listened to the address without interrupting him, but as soon as Bradshaw had concluded, his majesty, under visible agitation, prepared to speak. Bradshaw commanded him to be silent, and directed the clerk to read the sentence. The sentence ran as follows. "Charles Stuart is, and standeth convicted, attainted, and condemned of high treason and other high crimes, and sentence upon Saturday last was pronounced against him by the court, to be put to death, by the severing of his head from his body, of which sentence execution remaineth to be done. These are therefore to will and require you to see the said sentence executed, upon the morrow, being the thirtieth day of the present month of January, between the hours of ten in the morning and five in the afternoon."

The king's trial.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

He added: "The sentence now read and published is the act, sentence, judgment and resolution of the whole court," and the whole court stood up in sign of assent.*

The king endeavoured again to speak, but after a short altercation Bradshaw sternly said, "Guards, withdraw your prisoner." The king was now carried to the place where the sedan-chair waited for him, being subjected as he went down the stairs to the grossest insults. Some of the troopers threw their lighted pipes in his way, others blew the fumes of their tobacco in his face, and cried close to him, "Justice!" "Execution!" Yet, amidst all this disturbance, there came a cry from the crowd, kept back by the soldiers, "God save your Majesty! God deliver your Majesty from the hands of your enemies!" Such were the feelings of the unarmed multitude. As the king passed to Whitehall, the troops lining each side of the road, there was a crowd of people before every shop and at every door and window, most of them silent, but many weeping and not a few praying aloud for the king. Charles had regained his accustomed serenity, and felt, in the words of Shakspeare, with whose writings he was familiar,

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm from an Anointed King,
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord.

On the 28th, being Sunday, the king was again removed from Whitehall to St. James's. Here Bishop Juxon waited to receive him. When first he saw the king, the bishop burst into an agony of grief, and was mildly rebuked by his sovereign. "Leave off this, my lord; we have not time for it. Let us think of our great work, and prepare to meet that great God, to whom,

* I have chiefly followed the account given in the State Trials and by Sir Thomas Herbert.

ere long, I must give an account of myself. I hope I shall do it with peace, and that you will assist me therein. We will talk no more of these rogues in whose hands I am; they thirst after my blood, and they will have it, and God's will be done. I thank God I have heartily forgiven them. I will talk of them no more."

Calmness of the king.

Sir Thomas Herbert observes that Charles did not utter a reproachful word upon any of his judges (albeit he knew that some of them had been his domestic servants), or against any member of the House or officer of the army. He passed the rest of the day in pious conference with the bishop, but it was with great difficulty that he obtained permission to enjoy the privacy of his apartment. Colonel Hacker posted two soldiers at the door, and all the while that Juxon was with him the door was opened every few minutes by a rude sentinel, to make sure that the king was there. His own desire was to keep his mind calm, and not to be disturbed by the society, even of his friends. He excused himself from receiving his nephew the Prince Elector, the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, the Earls of Southampton and Lindsay. He commended himself to their prayers, and they acquiesced in the wisdom of his determination. There came also, to St. James's, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Vines, Mr. Caryll, Mr. Dell, and some other London ministers, who requested permission to pray with him and to perform other "offices of service." The king returned them thanks for their love to his soul, hoping that they, and all other his good subjects, would in their addresses to God, be mindful of him; but as he had made choice of Bishop Juxon, whom he for many years had known to be a pious and learned divine, and able to minister ghostly comfort to his soul, suitable to his present condition, he would have none other.

Rudeness of his guards.

The king was comforted by a letter from the Prince

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

of Wales, brought to him by Mr. Seymour, one of the household of the prince. Seymour, when he saw the king, was unable to restrain himself; he kissed the king's hands, he clasped his legs, and uttered lamentations, until Hacker came in with his attendants, and was evidently abashed. Of the affecting interview between Charles and his two children, who alone at this time remained in England, Henry Duke of Gloucester, who was about seven years of age, and the Lady Elizabeth, who was about thirteen, Bishop Juxon appears to have been a silent spectator. That passage of history is too well known to be repeated here.

Our business being with the Bishop of London, we have only to say that he preached before the king at St. James's, taking for his text Romans ii. 16: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of all men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." The king received the Holy Communion, and spent the rest of the day in conference with the bishop.

Preparations for the execution of the king.

It was determined that the execution of the king should take place on the 30th January between ten and five o'clock, but when it became necessary to sign the fatal order, several of the Commissioners betrayed an unwillingness to act. They made as if they were going to the House of Commons, but were deterred by some persons stronger-minded, and were compelled to affix their names to the document. "Cromwell himself," says Guizot, "gay, noisy, daring as ever, gave way to his usual coarse buffoonery, and after having signed himself, he smeared with ink Henry Martin's face who sat beside him, and who immediately did the same to Cromwell. Colonel Ingoldsby, his cousin, who had been appointed a member of the court, but had never taken his seat, accidentally came into the hall. 'This time,' said Cromwell, 'he shall not escape;' and, laughing aloud, he seized

Ingoldsby, and, with the assistance of a few other members, put the pen between his fingers, and, guiding his hand, obliged him to sign." *

The order for the execution, when signed, was addressed to Colonel Hacker, Colonel Huncks, and Lieutenant Phayre, who were charged to see the execution. Intercession had been made for the king by the foreign ambassadors and ministers, but to no purpose. The king was well aware that nothing could extricate him from his present difficulties, and, from his constant fear of assassination, it was probably a relief to his mind to know what kind of death he was to die. Most part of the day preceding his execution he passed in prayer and meditation; some hours after midnight having elapsed before the Bishop of London left him. He requested the bishop to be with him early the next morning, but before he went Juxon joined with Herbert in persuading Colonel Hacker to show some consideration and kindness to his royal prisoner. Hacker, being in command of the guards, would have placed two musketeers in the king's bedchamber; when the king was made aware of his intention he made no reply, but only gave a sigh. The bishop and Herbert, apprehending the disturbance which would be given the king in his meditations and preparations for eternity, went so far as to represent the barbarity of such conduct, and they did not leave the colonel until he had reversed his order, by withdrawing the men from the king's chamber and placing them at the door.

Behaviour of Colonel Hacker.

The king slept soundly for four hours; he roused Herbert at an early period, "for," said his majesty, "I will get up, having a great work to do this day. Herbert," he said, "this is my second marriage day; I would be

* Guizot, Hist. Eng. Revolution, p. 430. State Trials, 1219; Thos. Wayte's Trial. Harris' Life of Cromwell, p. 201. Mark Noble's Memoirs of the Protectoral House, i. p. 118.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

as trim to-day as may be, for before night I hope to be espoused to my Blessed Jesus." He then appointed what clothes he should wear. "Let me have a shirt on more than ordinary," said the king, "by reason the season is so sharp as probably will make me shake, which some observers will imagine proceeds from fear. I would have no such imputation. I fear not death; death is not terrible to me. I bless my God I am prepared." *

Care of the king about his dress.

He sends messages and books to his children.

Precisely at the time appointed, the Bishop of London arrived. The king sent messages and some small presents to his children. It is interesting to know the books he selected for their edification. They were Bishop Andrewes' sermons, Laud against Fisher, and Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. These were to be presented to the Princess Elizabeth. To the Duke of Gloucester he sent King James's works and Dr. Hammond's Practical Catechism. He sent presents also to the Earl of Lindsay and to the Duchess of Richmond.

He passed an hour in private with the bishop. He then summoned Herbert to his presence. The bishop went to prayer. Some of my readers will remember the office used on the 30th January, even in our own times.

Lesson for the day.

The 27th chapter of St. Matthew relates the Passion of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. When the service was concluded, the king asked the bishop if he had made choice of that chapter as being so applicable to his present condition. The bishop replied, "May it please your gracious majesty, it is the proper lesson for the day, as appointed by the calendar." The king was much affected by the coincidence. At the king's chamber door a knock was heard. Herbert affected not to hear it, but the knock was repeated a little louder, and the king directed Herbert to go to the door. When Herbert de-

* Herbert, p. 185.

manded what was required, Colonel Hacker, for he it was who knocked, replied he would speak with the king. The king said, "Let him come in." The colonel, who was evidently under some agitation, told his majesty that it was time to go to Whitehall, but that he would there have some time of further rest. The king bade him go forth, and said he would presently follow. For some time Charles remained at his private devotions, and then, taking Bishop Juxon by the hand, he looked on him with a cheerful countenance, and said, "Come, let us go." Hacker had given them a second warning. Through the garden the king passed into the Park; there he made a stand. He asked Herbert the hour of the day, and taking a silver watch, which usually hung by his bedside, he delivered it as a keepsake or parting gift to his faithful servant Herbert. Companies of foot lined each side of the pathway as the king passed. A guard of halberdiers, in company, marched before him, another guard behind; the drums beat; the noise became so great that it was scarcely possible for one man to hear what another said to him. These precautions of an armed minority would not have been rendered necessary if the majority of the people were not known to be, though powerless for the want of a leader, on the king's side.

The king proceeds to the place of execution.

The king walked on bravely and unmoved. On his right hand he was escorted by the Bishop of London, with Colonel Tomlinson on his left. Between the guards and the king, Mr., afterwards Sir Thomas, Herbert, was permitted to take his place. The king held some conversation with Colonel Tomlinson, who, though holding command under the rebels, was evidently a gentleman, and treated his majesty with the respect due to a great man who had fallen to a low estate. What is now called Parliament Street was at that time crossed by two ranges of buildings belonging to the palace of Whitehall, with wide arched gateways

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

crossing the street and forming the public thoroughfare; one gateway was opposite to Privy Gardens, and there was a way over it by which a visitor might pass from St. James's Park. Arriving at the stairs at Whitehall, the king passed into his bedchamber, where after a short repose he joined with the bishop in prayer. He then called upon Mr. Herbert to bring him some bread and wine, which being brought, the king "broke the manchet," and ate a mouthful of it. He drank a small glass of claret wine, and then retired again with the bishop to complete his devotions. It was a solemn time for these three, expecting every moment to hear the last and fatal knock of Colonel Hacker at the door. Meantime his majesty told Herbert which satin night-cap he would like to use. This was provided, and, while the king was at private prayer, Herbert told the bishop the king's orders that a night-cap should be ready, but declared himself to be so unnerved that he could not endure the sight of his master on the block. Bishop Juxon, with his usual presence of mind and desire to assist others, told Herbert to give the cap to him, and himself to wait at the end of the Banqueting House, near the scaffold, to take care of the king's body. "For," said he, "that and his interment will be our last office." At the chamber door the last signal was now given by Colonel Hacker. The bishop and Herbert fell weeping upon their knees, and the king gave them his hand to kiss, and helped the bishop to rise, for Juxon was no longer a young man. The king then desired that the door might be opened, and he bade Hacker to proceed, saying he would follow. Along the galleries of the Banqueting House there was a guard; but behind the soldiers, men and women crowded, though with some peril of life and limb, to behold the fate of royalty. The king's countenance brightened when, as he passed by, he heard them pray for him, and Herbert

remarks, "that even the soldiers, instead of rebuking the crowd or insulting the king, seemed afflicted by what they were commanded to do." At the extremity of the hall, an opening was made in the wall leading straight to the scaffold, which was hung with black. Two men, dressed as sailors and masked, stood by the axe. The king stepped forward with his usual dignity of manner, and looked out for the people to whom, according to custom, he expected to be permitted to address a few parting words. But the whole space was occupied by the troops, and no one could approach. He turned therefore towards Bishop Juxon and Tomlinson, and said, "I cannot be heard by many but yourselves, but to you I will address a few words." He seemed damped by being deprived of an audience, and delivered a speech which would have had greater effect if the speaker had been animated by a crowd of persons sympathising with him. His object was to shew that he had acted right, and that the cause of the people's misfortune was traceable to the contempt of the rights of the sovereign. While he was speaking some one touched the axe. The king said to him, "Touch not the axe; that may hurt me;" the gentleman replied, "Indeed I will not." The concluding portion of the king's address is the more interesting to the reader because it confirms what we have previously stated of the principle (an erroneous principle, all must now admit) which influenced Strafford and Laud, and remained to the last fixed in the mind of the king. His words were: "For the people, truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whatsoever, but I must tell you that their liberty and freedom consists in having government, in having those laws by which their lives and their goods may be most their own. It is not their having a share in the government; that is nothing appertaining to them. A subject and a sovereign are clean different things, and,

The king's last speech.

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

therefore, until you do that, I mean that you put the people in that liberty as I say, certainly they will never enjoy themselves.

"Sirs, it was for this that now I am come here; if I would have given way to have all laws changed according to the power of the sword, I need not have come here, and therefore I tell you (and I pray God it may not be laid to your charge) that I am the martyr of the people. 'Tis truth, sirs. I shall not hold you much longer; I could have desired a little time longer, because I would have a little better digested this I have said; therefore I hope you will excuse me. I have delivered my conscience. I pray God to take those courses that are best for the good of the kingdom and your own salvation." There was a pause. It was evident that the king, disappointed of his audience, had not been stirred up to deliver all that was in his mind.

The bishop spoke to him, and said, "Though your majesty's affections may be very well known as to religion, yet it may be expected that you should say something thereof for the world's satisfaction." "I thank you," replied the king, "I thank you heartily, my lord; for that I had almost forgotten it. 'Tis truth, sirs, my conscience in religion, I think, is well known to all the world, and therefore I declare before you all that I die a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left to me by my father; and this honest man I think will witness it." Turning to Colonel Hacker he said, "Take care that they do not put me to pain." It was not death that he feared, but pain that he would avoid. Another gentleman coming near to the axe, the king said, "Take heed of the axe; pray take heed of the axe." He told the executioner that he would say a very short prayer, "And when I thrust out my hands——" Once more he turned towards the bishop and

said, "I have a good cause and a gracious God on my side." The bishop replied, "There is but one stage more; the stage is turbulent and troublesome. It is a short one, but you may consider it will soon carry you a very great way. It will carry you from earth to heaven, and there you will find a great deal of cordial joy and comfort."

Last words with Juxon.

"I go," added the king, "from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world." "You are exchanged," said the bishop, in conclusion, "you are exchanged from a temporal to an eternal crown; a good exchange."

The king took off his cloak, and with it his "George," which he delivered to the bishop, saying, "Remember." Having asked the executioner whether his hair was well, that is, sufficiently, tucked up under his cap, he put on his doublet, and being in his waistcoat, he put on his cloak again. "When I put out my hands this way," stretching them out, "then——" He stood with his hands and his eyes lifted up, and said a few words to himself. He stooped down; he laid his neck upon the block. The executioner approached him again, to put his hair under his cap. The king thought he was going to strike; he exclaimed, "Stay for the sign." "Yes, I will," was the reply, "and please your majesty." A short pause ensued; the king stretched forth his hands. At one blow his head was severed from his body. The executioner held up the head, and shewed it to the people, saying, "Behold the head of a traitor!"

King Charles is beheaded.

> Nothing in his life
> Became him like the leaving of it; he died
> As one that had been studied in his death
> To throw away the dearest thing he owed
> As 'twere a careless trifle.

A suppressed but almost universal groan was uttered by the people, removed at a little distance from the

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

troops. The groan was heard by Cromwell, and a troop of horse was marched rapidly from Charing Cross to King Street, and another from King Street to Charing Cross, to disperse and scatter the multitude.*

"Remember."

Great curiosity was excited to ascertain the meaning of the king when he said to Juxon, "Remember." A plot was suspected, and the bishop's papers were examined. But perhaps he owed it to the universal respect that was shewn him, that his assertion was accepted as true when he said that the last word of the king had reference to the conveyance of the "George" to the Prince of Wales, with a message from his dying father, to the effect that if the prince were ever restored to the crown, he might forgive the authors of his death.†

Royal obsequies.

The ruling authorities, under the influence of Oliver Cromwell, consented to the decent burial of the king. Cromwell, well knowing the state of public opinion, would not permit the funeral to take place in Westminster Abbey. At public funerals a large assembly was accustomed to be gathered together, and the feelings already exhibited, and partially expressed, until silenced by the presence of the soldiers and the drums of the troops, made it very doubtful as to what would occur if on such an occasion as the king's funeral a large concourse of people were brought together. He knew that any disrespect to the remains would be equally impolitic. Windsor had been one of the burying-places of the English kings; and, before the invention of railroads, Windsor appeared to be further from London than it is now regarded. It was wisely determined that the body of the king should be laid unostentatiously in a grave to be prepared for it in St. George's Chapel. The body, placed in its coffin,

* Ellis's Letters, iii. p. 323. The description is given by Philip Henry, himself a spectator.

† Echardt, ii. pp. 643–646.

was conveyed by Bishop Juxon and Herbert to the back stairs of Whitehall, there to be embalmed. The royal corpse, when embalmed, was placed in a leaden coffin, was conveyed to St. James's Palace, and was then placed in a hearse, covered with black velvet, and drawn by six horses. This was followed by four mourning coaches, containing those who obtained the dangerous privilege of paying the last honours to their slaughtered sovereign and much-loved master. At Windsor, the body of the king was conveyed first to the Deanery, and thence to the king's usual bedchamber in the Castle.

Choice of the resting-place.

The Bishop of London, together with the noblemen and gentlemen to whom the performance of the royal obsequies was entrusted, proceeded, meanwhile, to select a proper resting-place for his remains. This was necessary, because the interior of the building, spoiled by the superstition or mistaken piety of the puritans, lay in a state of melancholy devastation. As they searched, they came upon the graves of King Henry VIII. and of Queen Jane Seymour, and here they determined to lay their late royal master. The body of King Charles, it was decided, should lie in this vault over against the eleventh stall of the sovereign's side of the choir. On the 7th February the royal remains were carried from the king's bedchamber into St. George's Hall, and thence they were borne to the Chapel. The day had been fine when the little procession started, but before it entered the Chapel the snow had fallen so thickly that the velvet pall was perfectly white, and those who stood around the grave were trembling with the cold. The Bishop of London took his place at the head of the vault, where he stood with his Prayer Book spread to begin the Service, and to perform, for the comfort of the mourners, the last rites of the Church. He was sternly silenced by Colonel Whichcote, governor of the Castle, who, with some of his officers, had intruded into the bishop's

CHAP. XXXVIII

William Juxon. 1660–63.

presence. He declared that the Book of Common Prayer had been put down by authority, "and never," he exclaimed, "shall it be used in any garrison in which I have command." Juxon, with his usual discretion, avoided any altercation, and bowed in meekness to the colonel's will. The tears and secret prayers of the faithful followers of a monarch they had loved and had faithfully served, were not however to be restrained; theirs was a grief that did not speak, but it whispered the "o'erfraught heart," in spite of the stern looks of the colonel. The coffin was lowered; the mourners looked in upon the grave; and there, on a silver plate attached to its leaden surface the mourners read the simple inscription, "King Charles, 1648." Over the coffin was thrown the black pall by which it had been previously covered. The governor ejected the mourners from the Chapel as soon as he could drive them away; and to prevent their return to the Chapel, he took up the keys and carried them away.

The most absurd reports were circulated by the puritans with reference to the funeral, and the burial-place of the king. Among others it was said, that the coffin was an empty one, and that the king was interred elsewhere. All this was finally set at rest in the year 1813, when, under the inspection of the Prince Regent, afterwards George IV., the vault was opened. Sir Henry Halford officiated on the occasion, and to him we are indebted for a statement which fully corroborates the historical notices of this event. Into the details of this statement the historian of Juxon is not obliged to enter.

## CHAPTER XXXIX.

Juxon dispossessed of his papers and threatened with imprisonment.—Returns to Little Compton.—Private resources.—State of Clergy.—Fanatics.—The Engagement.—Juxon in his retirement.—Performs Service according to Prayer Book.—Toleration of Cromwell.—Juxon great in the hunting-field.—Anecdotes.—The Restoration.—Translation of Juxon.—Savoy Conference.—Baxter's Prayer Book.—Coronation of Charles II.—Convocation.—Parliament impatient for settlement of Religion.—The Act of Uniformity.—Death of Juxon.—His benefactions and will.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

THE high character and courteous bearing of Juxon during his prosperity had so far conciliated his enemies, that he was permitted, for a short time, to retire to Fulham. From thence he was summoned to appear before the High Court of Justice. It was supposed by his associates that, as he had been the friend of Archbishop Laud and had acted with the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Wren, he would, with the latter, be committed to the Tower. He was indeed dispossessed of all his papers, and of the "George" which the late king had committed to his custody; and he was examined as to the king's last word, "Remember." But then he was left in peace.

Juxon dispossessed of his papers.

He retired to an estate he possessed in Little Compton in Gloucestershire. He appears to have possessed private means, and to have been in good circumstances. He certainly assisted many of the poorer clergy; but it does not appear that, like Sheldon and some other royalists who had private resources, he transmitted any sums to

Returns to Little Compton.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

the Court of Charles II. It is to this circumstance that we may attribute the fact of his receiving little molestation, except perhaps on his first retirement, when he certainly stood in awe of the soldiers of the Commonwealth. We read of there being a hole in the wall at his residence, in which, when alarmed, he could find a hiding-place. Though surrounded by a population evidently loyal to the king, he was well aware that an unarmed majority could do little against an armed minority.

State of clergy.

The clergy had suffered deeply during the presbyterian ascendancy. On the most frivolous pretences, pious clergymen were driven from their parishes, and were then prosecuted as absentees. The deprived clergy and their families had been reduced to the most abject poverty. It is true that a provision had been designed to assist the outlawed families by an ordinance which directed that a fifth part of the revenues of each church should be paid to the family of the deprived incumbent. But this payment was often refused by the presbyterian intruder, or evaded by the course just mentioned, when those who had been deprived were afterwards prosecuted as absentees.*

Fanatics.

During the few years of their power, it is reported by Edwardes, one of the party of Independents, that the fanactics had been guilty of all manner of outrages; administering exteme unction; preaching antinomianism and a disregard of the Sabbath; that there were not only lay preachers, but women and boy preachers; "Jeroboam's priests, the lowest of the people," being numbered among the grievances introduced. The English constitution was dissolved; the House of Commons, such as it was, consisting of about eighty members, voted the House of Lords to be useless, and the office of a king dangerous to the

* Fuller.

State. A decree called the Engagement was drawn up, in which an oath was administered to the people, pledging them to support the government established.

The Engagement.

> Though fallen on evil days,
> On evil days though fallen and evil tongues,
> In darkness and with dangers compassed round,

Juxon, when retiring to his own house, associated with the country gentlemen around him, who were Cavaliers at heart. Always prepared to do his duty, in spite of the very severe penalties attached to an attendance on Divine Service according to the rites of the Church of England, every Sunday, at Chastellon House, the residence at that time of a family named Jones, the bishop did not fear to perform that Service. Although no man was permitted to read the Book of Common Prayer, even before his own household,* still Juxon's ministry was attended by many of the inhabitants of Little Compton and of Chastellon, who dared the worst for conscience sake. It was not long that Juxon had thus to seek concealment, for the notion of toleration had forced itself into the mind of Oliver Cromwell.

Juxon in his retirement.

Divine Service.

It is remarkable that two such men as Jeremy Taylor on the one side, and Oliver Cromwell on the other, had arrived almost at the modern idea of toleration. Oliver Cromwell, always practical, was willing enough, though he himself had become an Independent, to permit the presbyterians to regard their own as the established sect, but he determined to compel them to abstain from the persecution of other religionists, provided that they did not give trouble to the existing government. In speaking of the presbyterians in 1654, he said, "I am the only one who has known how to subdue that insolent

Toleration of Cromwell.

* Evelyn's Diary, ii. p. 64. Lathbury, Prayer Book, p. 287.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

sect, which can suffer none but itself." "Can we not remember," he wrote from Edinburgh to the Scottish ministers, "what we ourselves have suffered lately from intolerance, and shall we inflict the like severities on our brethren?" As a sop to the presbyterians he excluded from the toleration he claimed for other sects, "prelacy, popery, blasphemy, and profaneness." That it was a mere form thus to exclude the Church of England, denounced under the word "prelacy," soon became apparent. The real question he asked, and he obtained an easy answer through his many spies, was simply this, "Do the clergy of a certain district submit to the government of the Protector?"

This gave much offence to some of the most intolerant of the presbyterian preachers in London; they complained that the Cavalier clergy debauched the minds of the faithful, and drew them away from their regular ministers. "Do they so?" said the Protector; "I will give order concerning this." So far the answer was satisfactory. "But hold," he exclaimed, "in what manner do the Cavaliers debauch your people?" "By preaching," replied the ministers. "Is that all?" said Cromwell; "then preach them back again."

It is evident that Juxon, at this time, enjoyed his retirement, and without neglecting, as we have seen, his official duties, he lived like a country gentleman. Among his studies, at this time, he composed his sermon on the death of Charles I. It is a production by no means equal to the subject, and it leads us to conclude, that Juxon's, though a laborious and judicial mind, was a mind by no means gifted with the glow of genius. Juxon was the last of the primates who asserted the rights of an episcopal baron to pursue the sports of the field. Whitelock informs us that "Juxon delighted in hunting, and kept a pack of good hounds, so well ordered and hunted, chiefly by his own skill and direction, that they

Great in the hunting field.

exceeded all other hounds in England for the pleasure and orderly hunting of them. He was a person of great parts and temper, and had as much command of himself as of his hounds." * A story was long traditional in the neighbourhood of Little Compton, "that Bishop Juxon's hounds running through a neighbouring churchyard, whilst certain puritans were engaged in seeking the Lord, a deputation from the offended congregation was sent to lay a complaint of the affair before Oliver Cromwell. 'Pray,' said the Protector in reply, 'do you think that the bishop prevailed on the hare to run through your churchyard at that time?' 'No,' was the rejoinder, 'and please your highness, we did not directly say he did, but through the churchyard the hare did go at that time.' 'Get ye gone,' replied the Protector, 'and let me hear no such frivolous complaints. Whilst the bishop continues not to give my government any offence, let him enjoy his diversion of hunting unmolested.'"

The bishop had conferred a great obligation on a gentleman in his neighbourhood, and refused to receive any kind of return. "Give me leave," said the gentleman, "to add at least one staunch hound to your pack?" This was an offer which the bishop could not resist; the dog was to be sent; it came; on its collar the name was engraved, "Jowler." Jowler was a silver drinking-cup, and the bishop was evidently amused by the determined gratitude of his friend. It became a law of the house that every stranger should take off Jowler's head at a draught.

"Jowler."

The Restoration found Juxon an old man, labouring under an incurable complaint; but he shared, no doubt, in the exuberant joy with which the return of the king was hailed. It was almost with one voice that England bade

The Restoration.

* Whitelock's Memorials, p. 324.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

welcome to the representative of our ancient kings. We chiefly account for the fact by a suggestion we have already offered to the consideration of the reader. The vast majority of the English people had remained loyal to their monarch, as was indicated by the sorrowful but suppressed murmur attendant upon the death of Charles I. The feeling was intensified by the publication of the Eikon Basilike, which was long supposed to be the king's own composition. And, although the opinion prevails that the king was not the author, the work had probably passed under his review.

Eikon Basilike.

But the king's army had been defeated, Charles himself was no general, and among loyal subjects, who at one time surrounded him, no master mind arose to inspire the people with enthusiasm, or to lead the Cavalier spirit into action by the formation of a new army. Hence England was governed by an armed minority, influenced secretly, for a time, and in the end ostensibly, by one who, let his faults be what they might, had a mind capable of bending all other minds to his will.

That mind was removed by the death of Oliver Cromwell; the army for a time remained, but without a leader. Monk, at its head, soon discovered that he was not the man to succeed the late Protector, and the Protector's children, though amiable in private life, were not worth fighting for.

The country watched with anxiety the movement of the army, and when Monk and his myrmidons made themselves one with the cause of the people, the nation became almost delirious with joy. The ordinances of the Long Parliament were most of them null and void for want of royal confirmation; therefore the episcopate assumed its former position in the several dioceses, and resumed the estates. But, though the bishops still claimed seats in the House of Lords as the representatives of their several baronies, they thought it prudent not to take their

seats until sanctioned by an act of parliament, since it was by act of parliament that of their baronies they were deprived. The Prayer Book was generally used immediately after the king's return. He attended the service of the Church of England in Canterbury Cathedral, and the Liturgy was restored to his majesty's chapel. A few days afterwards the two Houses of Parliament ordered that prayers should be offered in their respective Houses according to the ancient practice.

Nevertheless, difficulties were to be encountered. Out of 10,000 clergy, 7,000 had by the acts of the Commonwealth been unconstitutionally turned out of their livings. On the Restoration it was natural for them to claim their own against those who, though in possession, were nevertheless intruders. The prudence of Clarendon, now at the head of affairs, was exerted to restrain the clergy when claiming immediate restoration to what was undeniably their due, and he called upon the bishops to assist him in counselling patience, forbearance, and moderation. The episcopate itself had diminished in number, and, of that number, some were in exile and others in obscurity. Nine prelates were living at the time. A very judicious choice was made of Juxon to the primacy. The wisdom of this appointment has been denied by the followers of Burnet, on account of Juxon's old age and his many infirmities; but if we transport ourselves into the 17th century, we can understand why, however unwilling he might have been himself to undertake the office, no one else could have filled it without giving offence to the rampant loyalty of the land. Puritan writers and their followers are pleased to forget this, when they complain of the ejection of two thousand puritans after the passing of the Act of Uniformity. Juxon was old, he was infirm, but his intellect was as yet unimpaired. It would not have been tolerated if he, who stood by the

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

first Charles in his martyrdom, had not been called upon to place the crown upon the head of his successor.

Many reasons might have been urged for calling Sheldon to the primacy; but Sheldon was too wise a man to allow himself to be placed in a position so invidious. He could consult Juxon, he could assist and advise him, he could, in the archbishop's name, govern the Church, but he was willing to concede the primacy to Juxon, whose appointment, notwithstanding the snarl of Burnet, gave universal satisfaction.

Translation of Juxon to the See of Canterbury.

On the 3rd of September the congé d'élire was granted; on the 13th Bishop Juxon was elected, and his confirmation, which took place on the 20th, was observed with more than the usual solemnity:—the commission being addressed to all the bishops who had survived the late persecution. It took place amid a great concourse of orthodox clergy and gentry, who could not refrain from giving God thanks for the mercies of that day, and who also were touched at the sight of that aged man, whom they esteemed as a person of primitive sanctity, of great wisdom, piety, patience, learning, charity, and all apostolical virtues. Sheldon succeeded Juxon in the See of London, and was consecrated in Henry VII.'s Chapel on the 28th of October; Morley and Sanderson were consecrated at the same time, under a commission issued by Archbishop Juxon.

In the Savoy Conference, held under his primacy, the archbishop was unable to take an ostensible part; he could perform the routine duties of his office, but he shrunk from angry discussions. The chief business therefore devolved upon Bishop Sheldon, who, though through his tact he managed the whole affair, so far as the Church was concerned, with singular good taste and feeling, kept himself in the background, as unwilling to supplant the archbishop. He seldom appeared among the commissioners.

Although the Savoy Conference produced no result of any importance, it is an event which cannot be passed over without a brief notice.

Savoy Conference.

The king had made a promise of certain concessions to the presbyterians when he was at Breda. Careless and flexible as he was, he can hardly be said to have violated his word, when he appointed a conference to be held between them and the clergy, and when he deferred finally to the decision of parliament. The nonconformists had presumed before this on the good nature of the king, and they pressed him so hard, that he could not refrain from giving utterance to his indignation. They had come to Breda to seek a toleration for themselves, which would have been tantamount to an amalgamation of the Church with dissent; and yet they urged the king to lay aside the Liturgy, or to abstain from using it in the royal chapel. The Liturgy had never been laid aside by lawful authority, and would naturally become, on the Restoration of the regal government, the order of public worship. The king, with some warmth, therefore replied, that while he gave them liberty, he would not have his own taken from him.* They then petitioned for the disuse of the surplice, which only increased the dislike of the king to their intolerance. A conference nevertheless was appointed to be held under a royal commission. It consisted of twelve bishops, and of twelve dissenting ministers, to whom nine of each party were added to supply the place of members of the commission prevented from attending. The commission was appointed to meet in the ancient and splendid hall of the Savoy Hospital, of which the Bishop of London was master. And it was limited in time to four calendar months. The conduct of the bishops in the early part of the proceedings was calm, intelligible,

Conduct of the bishops.

* Clarendon, Hist. Reb., iii. p. 989. Cardwell's Conferences, p. 246.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

and dignified; they had no wish to make any alteration in the Prayer Book, though they were willing to make amendments, and were ready to receive suggestions. It remained therefore for their opponents to produce their objections and complaints. The dissenting party understood the nature of the position thus assumed by the bishops. Instead of engaging in any jangling controversy, the bishops took their proper places as judges. They had the more right to act thus, for the presbyterians had been careful to state that they spoke as private persons, and not as representatives of any body of men. They came to jangle as individuals, without any authorisation from their people to act. The puritans, on realising their position, were inclined to retire from what they had expected to be a disputation, but which they found to be an appeal to their judges. But they were overruled by Baxter, who sent in his adhesion, which was followed by his colleagues. Objections to the Prayer Book were sent in on the 4th of May. We need not here enter into an examination of these; for the alterations in the Prayer Book in this, its last review, will come under our notice when speaking of Convocation and the Act of Uniformity.

By the terms of the commission, the existing Book of Common Prayer was to be the basis of the future Liturgy. It was to be compared with the primitive Liturgies—the acknowledged models of public worship—and while an attempt was to be made to satisfy weak consciences, this principle was to be their guide. The bishops, and churchmen generally, must have been taken by surprise, in which astonishment, admiration, and anger were commingled, when they found that Baxter was actually prepared to force on the Church a crude Liturgy, so to say, which had been composed by himself in a fortnight.*

Baxter's Prayer Book.

* Cardwell's Conferences, p. 259.

Baxter's Liturgy was to supersede or to have the same legal force as the Liturgy then in existence in the English Church—the growth of ages—traceable to the primitive times, and substantially the same (Romish innovations having been abscinded) as had existed from the time of St. Augustine. This extraordinary production, the clever work of a learned man, without any ecclesiastical sympathies or acquaintance with Church affairs, was slightly altered by the dissenting commissioners, to show at once their independence on the one hand, and on the other their complicity with the conduct of their leader. The presentation of this extraordinary work was accompanied by an address drawn up by Baxter, eloquent but violent and intolerant. He called it a petition of peace, but it was rather a declaration of war, hurling defiance at his opponents. He asked for peace, but the thought of conciliation seems never to have crossed his own mind.

The bishops received the objections, raised against the Book of Common Prayer. These objections, as Bishop Short observes, were so numerous, and many of them of so little importance,* that it would weary the reader to state them at length. The bishops replied, and a re-

* Short, p. 404. We have an ex-parte statement of the proceedings of the Savoy Conference by Baxter, which requires to be corrected and brought to the test by fragmentary notices, to be gathered from other writers. The statement is given in an animated and interesting style, written in a kindly spirit from the puritan standpoint, by Dr. Stoughton, in his "History of the Church of the Restoration." The author states his facts fairly, but can hardly be called, when we come to the inferences to be deduced from those facts, impartial. It is not possible for an earnest writer to be impartial: his mind being imbued with the principles, if not the prejudices on one side of the question, he cannot be expected to throw himself into the mind of his opponents. The student of history should ascertain the bias of an historian's mind, and then, as in a game of bowls, he must make due allowance for the bias, and in the end he will reach the truth.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

joinder was sent by the dissenters, containing matter on either side which will be more conveniently considered on a subsequent occasion.

The Church party was accused of causing numerous delays, and of avoiding discussion. In these days, we seek for union and the combination of parties; the tendency is to yield too much. But in the seventeenth century, Sheldon, acting under Juxon, preferred an open separation to an internal schism. He saw that churchmen had everything to lose, and the dissenters everything to gain. He clearly understood that although the puritans did not ask for the establishment of presbyterianism, they laboured for what Baxter called a reduced episcopacy, that is, presbyterianism under another name. The presbyterians sought for an alteration in the established forms of worship, on grounds so captious and frivolous, that if it had been conceded the principles of the Church would have ceased to exist.

The business of the conference was little regarded, because in the first place, as has been seen, the dissenters having no authority to act, nothing definite could be accomplished. Moreover, all that could be brought before the conference would soon be legally settled by the convocation and the parliament, both of which had now been summoned. In the next place, the minds of the bishops were occupied in preparing for the coronation.

Coronation of Charles II.

The coronation was conducted, as we gather from Clarendon, on a scale of magnificence seldom surpassed, and such as to excite the admiration of foreigners more accustomed than the English to such exhibitions. The procession from the Tower to Whitehall was a complete ovation; and the splendours were repeated the next day, when the king passed from Whitehall to Westminster Hall, and thence to Westminster Abbey.

At the Abbey, the bishops and other dignitaries of the

Church were waiting at the west door to receive his majesty. Archbishop Juxon was unable to join in the procession, but by him the ceremony was performed,—with the exception of presenting the king to the people, at the several sides of the platform on which the throne was placed. Hence some persons were led to suppose that the administration of the coronation office devolved on Bishop Sheldon. This, however, was a mistake. With the exception thus mentioned, the venerable primate, though bowed down by age and an incurable infirmity, was prepared to do what was required at his hands—the Bishop of London being at hand to assist him; and, if need had been, to take his place. The bishops who, in magnificent copes, joined and made part of the royal procession, were most of them men who, to the present hour, are ranked among our greatest divines. Bishop Cosen, Bishop Warner, Bishop Morley, Bishop King, Bishop Gauden, had each a part to bear in the splendid ceremonial. They were supported by the dean and chapter of the Abbey in their vestments, and by the royal chaplains, having dignities, in their scarlet robes.

The archbishop administered the oath, and anointed the king; he delivered to him the orb; he invested him with the annulus and baculum, and placed a sceptre in his hands, with the usual prayers and benedictions; he placed the crown on his head. Then shouts were raised, "God save the king," and the trumpets sounded; and on a signal given, the guns of the Tower were "shot off." The peers and other officers put on their coronets and caps. The archbishop then administered the Holy Communion.

Juxon was the first to salute the king on each cheek, and to do homage; the Lords spiritual and the Lords temporal (the earls now wearing their coronets), succeeding him. What his feelings were, it is more easy to imagine than to describe;—and when he crowned the

CHAP. XXXIX.

son of his dear master, the last word that master uttered must have recurred to his memory—"Remember."

William Juxon. 1660–63.

This was the last public appearance of Archbishop Juxon. His attentive friend, the Bishop of London, was ever ready to render to him the aid he required. The archbishop gave token of some debility of mind, attended, as is often the case, with obstinacy. For instance, with his usual munificence, he rebuilt the great hall at Lambeth, but nothing could persuade him to build it in the modern style and connect it with the library. He was probably under the influence of his nephew, who was not the wisest of men.

Convocation.

A doubt had existed as to the expediency of calling Convocation; but the doubt gave occasion to a very powerful pamphlet on the subject by Dr. Heylyn. Such was the effect it produced on the mind of Clarendon, that shortly Juxon obtained permission to issue his mandate for the assembling of Convocation at St. Paul's, on the 8th of May, 1661.*

The people hailed with pleasure the renewal of the ceremonies attending the opening of Convocation, so long discontinued. The judges in their robes of office, the bishops in their red convocation chimars, the other clergy in their hoods, in long procession, advanced slowly through the nave of old St. Paul's, chanting the Te Deum. The Latin prayers were said, and a Latin sermon delivered.

The Bishop of London was appointed president, to act as the representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury, too infirm to attend. Of the Lower House, Dr. Henry Ferne, Dean of Ely, was chosen the prolocutor.

The splendour of this opening of the Convocation of Canterbury, stood in contrast with the opening of the

* Kennett, Register, p. 434.

Savoy Conference. There nothing was done but jangling and disputes; whereas the great council of the Church, being in correspondence with the Convocation of the northern province, deliberately proceeded to business, and had for its object, not contention, but legislation.

The first acts of Convocation were in accordance with the spirit of the age, although they were acts from which we feel grateful that we have been relieved. Special prayers were appointed to celebrate the Restoration. Services were drawn up for the 30th of January and the 5th of November. The great objection to these services is that they make the Church political; but they were forced upon Convocation by the violence of the loyalty displayed, not among the people only, but in both Houses of Parliament.

The clergy in convocation were fully sensible of the importance of the work before them. The Savoy Conference had caused it to be understood that there was no inclination on the part of the bishops, or of the clergy they represented, to yield to the mere caprices of the dissenters, who seemed more inclined to exasperate than to conciliate their opponents. But Convocation was nevertheless willing to revise the Prayer Book of Parker and Elizabeth; and if, on reference to primitive documents, they were able to do what their enemies desired, they were willing, without reference to that desire, to do so. They certainly evinced no inclination to hurry on the business, for the real despatch of which they met on the 21st of November. Letters authorising them to review and amend the Book of Common Prayer had been addressed to the Convocation of the northern province; and the northern Convocation appointed certain proxies or commissioners to act for their house in the lower house of the province of Canterbury, while the archbishop and his suffragans took their seats in the upper

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

house. The whole Church of England could thus act at once in Synod, according to the expressed desire of parliament.*

Parliament impatient to make a settlement of religion.

The caution and slow action of Convocation did not commend itself to the zeal of parliament. The House of Commons, impatient to make a settlement of religion, appointed a committee to make search for the Second Service Book of King Edward, but subsided at last into an acceptance of the Service Book of 1604. This, together with an act of uniformity, was sent to the Lords, who determined to wait for the decision of the Convocation.

The pressure from without increased. The king was accused, and justly, of want of zeal in the cause of the Church. The bishops laboured diligently, but determined not to be hurried into inconsistencies. They adhered to the instructions they had received, to compare the book of Archbishop Parker and Queen Elizabeth with the primitive liturgies and ancient documents of the Catholic Church. In short, the old Nicene rule was to be observed: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατεῖτο. If the alterations they proposed to make, not in the principles or substance of the Prayer Book, but in certain details, should prove satisfactory to the dissenters, a point would be gained; but truth, not conciliation, was their object. There were minute alterations, which it is not necessary here to notice. The important alterations were as follows. †

Alterations in the Prayer Book made by Convocation.

The Sentences, Epistles, and Gospels, and other extracts from the Bible, except the Psalter and the Ten Commandments, were to be taken from the Version of 1611. The absolution was to be pronounced by the "priest" alone, instead of the "minister." The book

* Kennett, Register, pp. 564–566.

† The list of alterations is taken chiefly from Cardwell's Conferences, p. 380. See also Joyce, Short, and Lathbury.

of Bel and the Dragon was re-inserted in the calendar of lessons. The prayers for the king and royal family, the clergy and people, together with the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the benediction, instead of being printed, as formerly, at the end of the Litany, were inserted in the order both of Morning and Evening Prayer. The Evening Service, which had formerly begun with the Lord's Prayer, was now opened with the Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Absolution, as in the Morning Service. In the Litany the words "rebellion" and "schism" were added to the petition respecting "sedition, privy conspiracy," &c. In a subsequent petition, the words "bishops, priests, and deacons" were employed instead of "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the church." Among the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were now introduced a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for Ember weeks, the prayers for Parliament and for all sorts and conditions of men, a thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and the general thanksgiving. For the third Sunday in Advent, and for St. Stephen's Day, new collects were to be appointed. In several places where the word used had been "the congregation," the word "church" was to be adopted instead. A distinct collect was supplied for Easter Eve, and a distinct epistle for the Feast of the Purification. The first of the anthems on Easter Day, the last clause in the prayer for the church militant, and the rubric as to "covering what remaineth of the elements with a fair linen cloth," were added. The order in council respecting kneeling at the Lord's Supper, rejected by Queen Elizabeth, was now restored, with one alteration: instead of "any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," as in the Prayer Book of 1552, it now read, "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

A new office was drawn up for the Baptism of Adults, this sacrament having been neglected by the sectaries; some slight alterations were made in the other offices of baptism, and the clause concerning the undoubted salvation of baptised infants dying before the commission of actual sin, was inserted. The preface to the Confirmation office was curtailed, and the reception of Holy Communion on the day of matrimony was no longer insisted upon as necessary in the Marriage Service. The words, "if he humbly and earnestly desire it," were appended to the rubric respecting absolution in the Visitation of the Sick; and the benediction, with the prayers that follow, were added to that service. In the order for Burial, the first rubric respecting persons unbaptised or excommunicate was added.

Forms of prayer were supplied to be used at Sea; and offices were provided for the 30th of January and the 29th of May, while the old service for the 5th of November was corrected. These and many other minor alterations, amounting, as Dr. Tennison computed, to about six hundred in number, were made in the Book of Common Prayer by the Convocation of 1662, and were finally ratified by the Act of Uniformity.

We are not to suppose that the objections to the proceedings of Convocation were confined to one party; for there was an extreme on the other side, headed by the learned Thorndyke. The omission of all intercession for departed souls, and of the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Communion, were regarded by him as serious imperfections; but he commanded so small a following, that the existence of this party is scarcely noticed in the general histories of the period.

The work of Convocation was laid before the king, and by him it was relegated to the consideration of the privy council. It thence passed, with the royal recommenda-

tion, to the two Houses of Parliament; where the work of the Church was made also the law of the land.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

On the 19th of May 1662, the Act of Uniformity received the royal assent; and the Earl of Clarendon, as Lord High Chancellor, was directed to convey the thanks of the House of Lords to the bishops and clergy assembled in convocation, for the great care and industry they had shown in their review of the Book of Common Prayer.

Act of Uniformity.

Thus did Archbishop Juxon live to see the triumph of the principles of which he had been the consistent advocate, through evil report and good report.

He was becoming more and more enfeebled, and death came to him as a relief, on the 4th of June 1663. His high office had been thrust upon him rather than sought by him. But he had striven to do his duty when called upon to act as primate, and while he felt his own infirmities, he had been willing and ready to do what he could for the Church of England. And now—

> He gave his honour to the world again,
> His blessed part to heaven, and slept in peace.*

He had expressed a wish that he might be interred in the Chapel of St. John's College, Oxford, the place of his education; to which he gave in his lifetime, or bequeathed by will, no less a sum than 500*l.* per annum. He had desired that his body should be decently buried, without pomp. His will in this respect was disregarded by his executors, and especially by his nephew. A more pompous funeral we have scarcely ever seen described. The body of the primate, taken to Oxford, there lay in state in the Convocation House. Here, by the public orator, the celebrated Dr. South, an oration was delivered in his praise. Sixty men on horseback attended the hearse, which was drawn by six horses with escutcheons on their foreheads and backs; the mourners appeared in fifteen

Funeral of Juxon.

* Shakespeare, Henry VIII., iv. 2.

CHAP. XXXIX.

William Juxon. 1660–63.

coaches, all drawn, except two, by six horses. The Garter King-at-arms, with four heralds, unable, through the pelting of a storm, to join the procession in their embroidered coats, were ready equipped to meet the corpse when it arrived at the Chapel. All the finery with the exhibition of which the rain had interfered, was now displayed. A ducal mitre, gilt, was placed at the head of the coffin, and at the feet lay a crosier, likewise gilt. It were wearisome to enter into the details of the ceremonial, which the reader may find in Le Neve, communicated to him by Dr. Rawlinson.

His benefactions and will.

Juxon thought of his birthplace, and he left 100*l.* to the poor of the parish of St. Peter, *alias* the sub-deanery, Chichester. Similar benefactions were made to the numerous parishes and places with which he had been connected, and his relations were affectionately remembered by him. His increase of the endowments of St. John's College we have mentioned; and we may here add that to the repairs of St. Paul's Cathedral he left 2,000*l.* He left his barge, and the furniture thereto belonging, to his reverend brother, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of London. He appointed Sir William Juxon his heir and executor, with directions to finish the hall at Lambeth. Besides his work at Lambeth, the aged archbishop spent a large sum in the repairs of Croydon. This was done in a public spirit, for he held the primacy only three years. He augmented the vicarages appropriated to his See, and deservedly won for himself the title of a munificent primate. He is said by Kennett to have been the author of a tract called χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη: but, judging from internal evidence, we should not feel inclined to give credit to the assertion. That he was considerate in enforcing the Act of Uniformity is probably true, as, in the Life of Sheldon, we shall show that this was the case with most of the bishops.



Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.

42925
283.09
H763
v. 11
Hook, W. F. D.D.

283.09
H763
v. 11
42925